ROME

THE GREAT PRIVATE INTERPRETER

by

PETER S. RUCKMAN

ROME – THE GREAT PRIVATE INTERPRETER

By the Same Author

MARK OF THE BEAST
THE BIBLE BABEL
SEGREGATION OR INTEGRATION
KINGDOM OF GOD VERSUS KINGDOM OF HEAVEN
A CHRISTIAN'S HANDBOOK ON MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE
THE REAL ISSUE: "TELL IT LIKE IT IS!"
and SELECTED SERMONS

THE BIBLE BELIEVER'S COMMENTARY SERIES
BOOK OF GENESIS
GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW
BOOK OF REVELATION

ROME

THE GREAT PRIVATE INTERPRETER

By
Dr. Peter S. Ruckman, Ph.D.

PENSACOLA BIBLE PRESS
post office box 6036 Pensacola, Florida

COPYRIGHT © 1969
PENSACOLA BIBLE PRESS

1st Printing . . . . . May, 1969

PRINTED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

175

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

Preface 1

The First Private Interpretation 5

The Second Private Interpretation 18

The Third Private Interpretation 24

The Fourth Private Interpretation 30

The Fifth Private Interpretation 45

The Sixth Private Interpretation 58

The Seventh Private Interpretation 65

The Eighth Private Interpretation 74

The italics in this book
are that of the author.

PREFACE

This booklet is not a criticism of Roman Catholics. God knows, and the world knows, that there are many fine Romanists who believe the Word of God and read it, and some of these have been "born again" according to the New Testament, and not according to the formulated traditions of the Hierarchy itself.

A famous man once said, "The only thing wrong with a Catholic is his church," and truer words were never spoken. The Catholic Church, as such, from its first private interpretations by Augustine, Eusebius, and Irenaeus, to those of the Council of Trent (1546), has been consistent in one thing – wresting and perverting the Word of God in an effort to force it to approve of her own heresies and traditions.

This booklet gives the eight great private interpretations of Rome. It needs little comment. Catholics will not read it for the three reasons that no Catholic reads any investigation of truth, other than his own subjective investigation.

1. Catholics are taught that anything written or preached contrary to the teachings and traditions of the Vatican (State) is a *lie,* even if Paul, Jesus, or Moses said it.

2. If Paul, Jesus, or Moses *did* say it, then it has to be privately interpreted by the Church to *conform* with tradition, in order that it can be taught the Catholic that there is no *lie* nor contradiction, except in the eyes of the *opposing reader, who is guilty of "private interpretation."*

3. Since all Catholics believe that the damnation of their soul is involved in a turning from *any* tradition of the Vatican (State), they dare not honestly investigate anything contrary to their own religion.

Now the scriptures command the Christian to "prove all things" (1Thes 5:21). He is told to bear with heresies and false gospels in order to test them and try them out (1Cor 11:19; 2Cor 11:4), and since the Christian *studies the Word, himself, as he was commanded to* (2Tim 2:15),

he is not worried about being "always ready to give an answer" (2Cor 4:2; 1Pet 4:11). No born-again Christian has to worry about reading and studying literature *contrary* to the Bible, for the Holy Spirit, in the Christian, has promised to lead and guide him into all truth (1John 2:27; John 14:26; John 16:13). These *plain* verses, understood everywhere, by all born-again Christians, prove forevermore that Catholics (as a church) *are not "born-again Christians,"* no matter what their canons and decrees may state. Born-again Christians do not only *face* error and falsehood confidently and cheerfully; armed with the sword of the Spirit, but they also desire to search it out if there be any truth in it, and put it to the test of the Word.

Rome, like a man on a chain gang, is the most "misunderstood church" in the world, and has to have its Knights of Columbus in full-time ministry of *explaining* the discrepancies between its teaching and Bible teaching, and alibiing the rumors that get out from time to time about Rome's "hellishness," which is supposed to be "holiness."

Rome's defense of her ridiculous and bigoted theology is a standard pattern that is found in 1500 years of church history.

1. Protestants are divided, themselves, about interpretation; therefore, *"We* must be right because we all agree as to the correct interpretation."

2. "When we can get all the Protestants back with us, that will be self-admission that they had the wrong interpretation, and *we* had the right one."

3. The fact that Protestants disagree about scripture is proof that the Holy Ghost is not guiding them, but *He* is guiding us, "because *we* all agree!"

This is the standard Jesuit, Dominican, Franciscan, Cappuchin, and Trappist answer to those who dare to raise their voice against the old harlot upon the seven mountains (Rev 17).

In the first objection mentioned above, no one takes

the time or trouble to note that even if Protestants are divided, *born-again Christians are not!* If born-again Christians *are* divided, they are only divided on *non-essentials*. Again, when it is said that Rome is agreed on interpretation, that only proves the *rottenness* of the Roman system, for the agreement (as will be seen) is on the *insufficiency* of the scriptures. Rome agrees on interpretation – but this interpretation is the private, false, wresting and distorting of *clear* passages, and the subterfuge of *obscure* passages for proof-texts. It is not scripture with scripture. It is not Christian. It is not true to the remaining verses. It makes other passages contradict, and it is a travesty of common sense and sound judgment. These "idle statements" can be disproved, conclusively, by examination of the eight passages listed in this book.

"No prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation," the Apostle Peter wrote. *Prophecy* plainly deals with events of the future. The warning, therefore, is clear (and it is clear from the man whom Catholics pretend is the first "vicar of Christ"), and any subject that deals with the future – such as life after death – is not to be "privately interpreted."

Rome, the great private interpreter of the scripture, is the past master and present champion of pretending to have the authority to tell about the *future*, even to the point of inventing two future states that do not exist except in the minds of private interpreters – Limbo and Purgatory.

This booklet lists eight cases where the private interpretation of the Roman Church is so apparent that not even a Pope could miss seeing it, unless he so desired in order to maintain the power and authority of his political state (Vatican). The scripture is first given, and then it is followed by the scriptures that compare with it, and then by the scriptures that oppose it, and then the interpretation derived from this comparison of *scripture with scripture*. Finally, you will find (and it is often very amusing if not downright ridiculous) the scriptures and

traditions which Rome has used to interpret the verse – so as to produce a doctrine which *contradicts* whole passages of verses in both testaments. Ignorance of the scriptures has been, is, and always will be Rome's strength in deceiving people. As America forsakes the Word of God and turns to religion and science, the private interpretation of Rome will take a stronger hold on Protestantism, until there are no "protests" left. (This then will be misinterpreted to mean that the "kingdom has come," and that the "erring sheep" have returned to the "flock," and to the "true interpreter" of scripture. What has actually happened is that the Protestants will have forsaken the Word of God, and having forsaken it, God will turn them over to the old "woman with the leaven" (Matt 13:33), who has been privately interpreting for 1500 years.)

To the sincere seeker of truth all that needs to be said is, "Keep seeking" (John 7:17; 8:32). To the Catholic who has been raised, nurtured, and fed on private interpretation, let it be said, "If you have the backbone to read it, go ahead; if you don't, then be willfully ignorant (2Pet 3:5), and face at the judgment the God who knows what He said, why He said it, and what He intended *you* to do about it." Rome cannot protect you *then*. *Neither can your priest.*

THE FIRST PRIVATE INTERPRETATION

The first private interpretation that Rome interests herself in, concerns the nature and characteristics of the "true church." The controversy centers in the passage found in Matthew 16:17,18.

"And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven. And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

For her first excursion into the liberty of private interpretation, the Roman Church has picked a controversial passage, given *before* the Resurrection, by a Jew to a Jewish audience, as the minister of the *circumcision* (Rom 15:8). What a place to start!!

Notice how the Catholic Church has *begun* by *overlooking* the epistles written to the Church, by the Apostle of the Gentiles, *who preached in Rome* – Paul. Instead of starting with Ephesians, Colossians, and Timothy, the Papist begins in a pre-crucifixion passage addressed to pork-abstaining, Sabbath-observing, temple-attending, circumcised *Jews!!* Why would anyone start here, to prove the most important doctrine of this age? (Matthew is the gospel that contains the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, Tribulation saints "losing salvation," entrance to the Kingdom on the basis of works to Jews, a Jewish genealogy which contains four Gentile women, a discourse which no one to this day can separate from the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. by Rome, and the Roman *nailing* of a Saviour!) *What a place for a Roman Bishop to start from to prove that his church is the only one!!*

Notice, first of all, the scriptures that deal with the passage, and which amplify it (without resorting to bishops, preachers, teachers, lexicons, and traditions for "interpretation").

"Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee . . . "

"But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name: Which were born, NOT OF BLOOD, NOR OF THE WILL OF THE FLESH, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John 1:12,13).

"But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by His grace, To reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the heathen; immediately I CONFERRED NOT WITH FLESH AND BLOOD" (Gal 1:15,16).

"That which is BORN OF THE FLESH IS FLESH; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again" (John 3:6,7).

Now this method of comparing scripture with scripture eventually yields the interpretation of the Holy Spirit Himself, who wrote the scriptures. You will observe that no "authoritative church" is needed to interpret *anything*. The author of the book is the only true interpreter, and the method that He has given is *scripture with scripture* – no *private* interpretation. The last place on God's earth where a Catholic should go to get the meaning of the verse is to some man or church that does not believe that God is able to show the meaning of the verse *with the Bible itself*. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (1Cor 15:50), and since the *kingdom of God*, in this age, is defined as "righteousness, and peace, and joy *in the Holy Ghost*" (Rom 14:17), then interpretation lies within the bounds of the scriptures that were written by the Holy Ghost.

Before examining the Jesuit routes around this great truth (that this interpretative power was given to the Roman Church by the Holy Ghost which indwells her, etc.), let us finish the first case of real private interpretation.

In the passage (Matt 16:17,18), God the Father has revealed something to Simon Peter which man did *not*

reveal to him. As Paul wrote in Galatians, " . . . the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal 1:11,12). Peter received his revelation from this same source. *Both had direct revelation on the meaning of the Word of God, without any priest interpreting anything and without any church passing on anything.* (It should be remembered that from Genesis to Matthew, the priests were never shown anything from God; the Word of God came by the *prophets*, and was then passed on to the "priests" to teach (Mal 2:7).

Simon Peter, then, has a pre-crucifixion revelation about the nature and person of Christ. Paul has a post-resurrection revelation of a gospel *that defines the nature of the body of Christ* (Eph 2,3). Then the first error in picking Matthew 16:17,18 as a "proof-text" is already manifest – for "scripture with scripture" reveals that the revelation to Simon Peter is on the *person of Christ*, and not on the *nature of the church.*

"That thou art Peter, and . . . "

"And when Jesus was come into PETER'S HOUSE, He saw his wife's mother laid, and sick of a fever" (Matt 8:14).

"But he turned, and said UNTO PETER, Get thee behind me, Satan" (Matt 16:23).

"THEN HE (PETER) began to curse and swear . . . " (Matt 26:74).

"BUT PETER took him (Cornelius) up, saying, Stand up; I myself also am a man" (Acts 10:26).

"But WHEN PETER was come to Antioch, I (Paul) withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed" (Gal 2:11).

Without interpreting anything, but by simply believing and reading simple English that deals with fourth-grade facts, it is apparent that – rock or not – Simon Peter is a married, cursing, mistaken, Satanic believer, who would *not let men bow down to him.* Is this the "vicar of Christ"? The Simon Peter of the Bible is not

in Rome, for Paul does not even mention him when writing to the Romans. He is not an Italian Pope. He did not dress like a Pope; he did not act like one; he did not speak like one; and when Peter wrote to the Christians and defined the *rock* he said plainly that the "Rock" was Christ – not Simon Peter! (See 1Pet 2:4-9.)

This is a scripture with scripture comparison. It needs no defense, and it lies outside the field of interpretation, since it is merely a *comparison of "like passages."* If a Romanist denied a single comparison, he would not be denying what a Protestant interpreted; he would be denying what the scriptures *said.*

"And upon this rock I will build my church."

"And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of THAT SPIRITUAL ROCK that followed them: AND THAT ROCK WAS CHRIST." (1Cor 10:4)

" . . . our God, HE IS THE ROCK, His work is perfect . . . OF THE ROCK that begat thee, thou art unmindful, and HAST FORGOTTEN GOD that formed thee . . . For THEIR ROCK IS NOT AS OUR ROCK, even our enemies themselves being judges." (Deut 32:4,18,31)

Notice how carefully and accurately the scriptures *interpret themselves,* without the aid of the Vatican State and the bachelor priesthood. Since no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation (and we are here dealing with the *prophecy* of "I *will* build my church"), the Holy Spirit has given the interpretation, without consulting any priest, preacher, church or teacher. The author of the scripture is very certain that the interpretation of a passage is found in the other passages, and not in the church councils of men who want to usurp the authority of the author of the scriptures. If any council decided that the Rock was anything other than what the scriptures *say* the Rock is, *then that council is decidedly a self-conceited bunch of irreligious asses.* (This is an unkind statement, if those attending the councils were to *make no profession* at *believing and accepting* what the Holy Spirit wrote. However, the councils are ordered, held, attended,

and promoted by people who profess to be the final authority on what the Holy Spirit wrote. In view of this, the term "irreligious asses" is a mild compliment.)

"I will build my church."

"And hath put all things under his feet, and gave Him to be the head over all things TO THE CHURCH, WHICH IS HIS BODY . . . " (Eph 1:22-23).

" . . . FOR HIS BODY'S SAKE, WHICH IS THE CHURCH: Whereof I (Paul) am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is GIVEN TO ME FOR YOU . . . " (Col 1:24-25).

"For we are members OF HIS BODY, OF HIS FLESH, AND OF HIS BONES" (Eph 5:30).

"For by one Spirit are we all BAPTIZED INTO ONE BODY . . . " (1Cor 12:13).

"Therefore if any man BE IN CHRIST he is a new creature . . . " (2Cor 5:17).

" . . . henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have KNOWN CHRIST AFTER THE FLESH, yet now HENCEFORTH KNOW WE Him no more" (2Cor 5:16).

" . . . they that are IN THE FLESH CANNOT PLEASE GOD. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you . . . " (Rom 8:8,9).

" . . . The bread which we break, is it not THE COMMUNION OF THE BODY OF CHRIST?" (1Cor 10:16).

"FOR WE BEING MANY ARE ONE BREAD, AND ONE BODY . . . " (1Cor 10:17).

Again the Holy Spirit, with the aid of His Holy Scriptures, gives the Christian definition of "Christ's Church." It is said to be *His* Church, and not yours or mine. It is *His* body, and not Rome's or Athens'. He builds it, not the popes and priests. It is *His,* and therefore He – not someone else – calls it "His," and "Mine," and never "Catholic," or "Holy Catholic," or "Holy Mother," or "Roman Catholic," or "Greek Orthodox." These are

man's, but the one of the text of Matthew 16:17,18 is *Jesus Christ's*. This is not interpreting anything – it is reading what can be read. (In a moment we shall see what the Romanist has done with these plain truths in order to develop his doctrine. Right now we are only laying the scriptures together that interpret the passage. It cannot be *misinterpreted* unless a fog of verbiage is raised to becloud the *plain* statements. Rome always uses this method to steer clear of the Holy Spirit's own interpretation of His own writing.)

"And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

"I am He that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of HELL AND OF DEATH" (Rev 1:18).

" . . . out of THE BELLY OF HELL CRIED I (Jonah) . . . THE EARTH WITH HER BARS was about me for ever . . . " (Jon 2:2,6).

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me . . . TO PREACH DELIVERANCE TO THE CAPTIVES . . . TO SET AT LIBERTY them that are bruised" (Luke 4:18).

" . . . When he ascended up on high, he LED CAPTIVITY CAPTIVE . . . " (Eph 4:8).

"By which also he went and PREACHED UNTO THE SPIRITS IN PRISON" (1Pet 3:19).

Hell is here defined as a literal place with gates and bars, and to get in or out of it, a key is needed. It is not *spiritualized* as the "powers" of Hell in a single passage, and every passage that deals with it, deals with it as a place, and not as an influence. Scripture with scripture teaches that there are people in the Old Testament held captive by it, who are loosed at the resurrection of Christ; and the promise in Matthew 16:17 is that Christ's church (whatever that church might be!) will not be kept prisoner by that place – *his "body" will break out and go*. (It should be remembered, of course, that *his body* is the definition of the church, according to the apostle to the Gentiles, who ministered in Rome, and to whom the revelation of the church was given. See above scriptures.

No one has *interpreted* anything. They mean what they say and say what they mean. If you have to "interpret them" to understand them, then you obviously have only been born of "flesh and blood," for the "we" of the Pauline passages is for people who have been born, *not of flesh and blood,* but of the Holy Spirit. See above references.)

Having now listed the Holy Spirit's interpretation of what He, Himself, wrote, let us turn to the Roman Catholic private interpretation of what they thought the Holy Spirit *intended* to mean. The difference is astonishing, if not downright incredible.

Canons and dogmatic decrees of the Council of Trent, A.D. 1563, third session, February 4, 1546 (stated finally in Trent, 1564):

"I acknowledge the holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Roman Church as the mother and teacher of all churches; and I promise and swear true obedience *to the Roman Pontiff,* the vicar of Christ and successor of blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles!"

First dogmatic constitution of the "church of Christ" (published in the fourth session of the Holy Ecumenical Council of the Vatican, Section IV):

"The supreme power of teaching is also included in the Apostolic primacy, which the *Roman* Pontiff, as the successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, possesses over *the whole church* . . . the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed by, who said: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church.' The Roman Pontiff is the true Vicar of Christ, and the *head of the whole church,* and the *father* and teacher of *all Christians." (!)*

"We teach . . . that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex-cathedra . . . that such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves and not from the consent of the church . . . this gift, then, of truth and never-failing faith was conferred by heaven upon Peter and his successors in this chair" (Vatican at Rome).

Observe, please, that in the Council's definition, *not*

one time has *anyone* turned to the Word of God to find out *who Peter was, what he did, when he did it, why he did it, where he did it, or to whom he did it.* Furthermore, no one has defined, from the scripture, *what the church is, where it started, who runs it, where it ends, or of what it is composed.* The word *Roman* is blatantly inserted for the word "Christian," with no concern whatsoever for correct usage of words. The title *"head* of the Church" is blasphemously wrenched from Christ Himself, and given to the Pope. This is not a misrepresentation of anyone. This is not "criticizing someone's religion." This is not falsifying the facts. The Council has stated (see above) that the Roman Pontiff is *"the head of the whole church."* This, in the face of Ephesians 1:22,23; Colossians 1:24,25! How much more privately can scripture be "interpreted"? Where the Word says one thing, and Rome flatly contradicts it and insists on another thing, and then pronounces an anathema (curse) on anyone who does not assent to it, we cannot help but wonder what about the Holy Spirit who wrote the book and who *deliberately contradicted the council's decree?* Is the Holy Spirit "anathema"?

Matthew 16:17,18 is an excellent test passage for private interpretation, as it shows that Rome is not only a private interpreter, but also a violent assailant of the Word of God. Where the Bible says *"My Church,"* the Pope says *"Roman Church."* (The term "Holy Roman Church" occurs two dozen times in the Council of Trent's decrees.) Where the Bible says "Christ is the head," the Pope says that *he* is the head. Where Jesus is the Christian's invisible head, no longer in the flesh, the Pope claims to be the Christian's head, still in the flesh.

The Catholics have a way of sophistry that leads them around these obvious, glaring, contradictions. In four books published by the Knights of Columbus, which we shall call A, B, C, and D – actually they are "The Way to Everlasting Life . . . the Catholic Church," "This is the Catholic Church," "Does the Bible Contradict Itself?," and "Let us Judge Catholics by the Bible," the Jesuit philoso-

phy is hard at work bringing forth the explanation. The more explaining that is done, the more it is apparent that someone has *rejected* what the scripture says about them, and has erected a system of private interpretation which *has to be explained*, because it is more obtuse, confusing, muddled, and complex than the scripture.

Book "C": "Those who are familiar with the Greek text of this passage (Matt 16:18) attempt to point out that there is a distinction between the two rocks (one is *petros* and the other *petra*) on which Jesus is to build His Church." In reply to *this interpretation (!!) (Note the slander. The Greek text has been "quoted," and not "interpreted"!)*, it must be pointed out that the language which Jesus spoke when making this statement was Aramaic, and in that language the distinction which the Greek text makes is impossible.

In plainer words, the Catholic has denied the *inspiration of the Greek text*, refused to believe what was written, and has fallen back to a private interpretation which says, in effect, that what Christ *really* said, the Holy Spirit did not have enough sense to record. Thus the interpretation of Rome is not only a *poor* interpretation, but criminal hypocrisy in absolutely refusing to believe that what was written in 1600 Greek manuscripts was the final authority, even though the Bible itself stated that "all scripture is inspired of God" (2Tim 3:16). Running to a language that Jesus *may* have used to prove that what He *did* use was not so, is the scurvy trick of a religious huckster. The word for Peter in Latin is not the same as the Latin for "rock." The word in English is not the same, the word in Greek is not the same, so the Catholic Church has absconded with the text, clear back into the *only language* they could find where the words are the same! This is private interpretation. The scriptures had already interpreted the word "rock" to refer to Christ, and Simon Peter ("the Prince of the Apostles") had already confirmed this interpretation before Rome had a Bishop! (1Pet 2:1-10).

Book "C": "If the foundation were removed with *the death of Peter,* the Church would collapse. (!) The gates of hell would surely prevail against it. And so the foundation which Christ appointed for His unfailing Church must be as lasting as the Church itself, and the authority and unfailing faith of Peter at his death must pass on to his successor in office, the *Bishop of Rome!"* (p.20). Here private interpretation becomes political speculation. Christ is said to be the *foundation* in 1Corinthians 3 – not Peter. The death of Peter would affect nothing. Paul succeeded Peter, not a Roman bishop; and if the Church collapsed it would be Jesus Himself collapsing, *for the church is his body!* (Eph 3, 5; Col 1; 1Cor 12).

The Roman Catholic interpretation, therefore, of Matthew 16:17,18, is one of the most powerful and obvious proofs in the Bible of Rome's incompetency to interpret any verse. The interpretation *crosses every verse in the Bible that deals with the subjects of the text* – Peter, the Rock, the gates of hell, and "my Church." Not once does Rome ever refer to scripture to even find out what the words mean. Peter is called the "Prince of the Apostles," although no such words are found in scripture. Yet words are found in scripture calling Paul *"chiefest* of apostles." The Church is defined by Rome as a Roman organization, whereas the Bible defines it as a body of born-again believers *"in Christ."* The gates of hell are defined as the powers of infidelity, while the Bible indicates a place below ground. The man chosen as the "head" of the church is not the head, since Christ alone is the head. And to top it all, the popes, coming from Peter, are given power to speak *infallibly, whereas Peter was dead-wrong in Bible interpretation, long after he was "converted" and "strengthening his brethren"!* (Acts 10; Gal 2).

There is no answer to these arguments except for the Catholic priest to thumb his nose at the Holy Spirit and insist that the Protestant is *"interpreting."* But no one has interpreted anything; the scriptures have merely been read,

noticed, believed, and applied. How can any church appeal to scripture for authority to change scripture when she does not believe in the final authority of scripture? Can I use John 3:16 to prove that *"I* so loved the world that I gave someone else's son, that if a man who 'endured to the end' got baptized, he wouldn't have to take a trip to Kansas City"? What kind of *religious authority* is that? How can a man in his sane mind believe a church that uses the Word of God as the authority for teaching something contrary to what the Word of God says?

Book "D": *"With us the prefix 'Roman' is not restrictive to a species or a section, but is simply declarative of 'Catholic.' It explains the meaning of Catholic applied to the religion of Christ, and asserts its unity. 'Roman,' as prefixed to Catholic, is therefore declaratory that the central point of Catholicity is Roman, the Roman See of Peter."* ("The Tablet," September 14, 1901, cited by Archbishop Vaughn.)

Notice that the self-definitions given by the Catholic authority always run *contrary to scripture,* and then "explain themselves at length" in order to convince someone that they are scriptural. Archbishop Vaughn's explanation is about as enlightening as a dark light on a ray of sunlight. He has only confused what was simple. This is the standard method. You convince people that the Bible is "confusing and difficult" by twisting and distorting it *until it really does need an explanation* – the explanation, of course, the Pope is more than willing to supply, for it is *his* explanation, and runs contrary to scripture and brings the "believer" into bondage to *his* system, instead of the simple, plain, blunt, crude, outspoken, clear, and vivid Word of God.

Note in the Archbishop's fabricated hallucination such peculiar terms as *"The Religion of Christ."* (Christ's "religion" was Old Testament, circumcised, pork-abstaining, non-shaving, Sabbath-observing Mosaic Judaism!!) Note again that the word "Roman" was only inserted to prove that the *"central point"* is not Jesus Christ, or the

Holy Spirit, or the Bible – but the *"Roman See"!!* That is, the explanation is invented to authorize a central point, which neither God nor the Bible recognizes, notes, authorizes, tolerates, desires, mentions, or approves. The Archbishop has invented a terminology in vain, for if it proved the point, it would only prove that *Roman Catholicism* is corrupt.

Before taking up the second of the eight private interpretations, let us lay out the evidence stroke by stroke where it can be seen. Further attempts to "explain this evidence away" only prove that the Catholic has gone to great lengths to invent something so complicated that, beside the English Bible, it would look like an IBM machine beside an egg beater.

BIBLE (with no "interpretation"):

Peter is a Jew who confesses Christ, and is promised keys to a *kingdom.* Paul is the God-called and God-commissioned apostle to the Gentiles, to whom *alone* was revealed the mystery of the church in this age, and who *straightened Peter out on false doctrine* (Gal 2).

ROME (with her own "interpretation"):

Peter is a Catholic who is promised the keys to *heaven.* Peter is the "Prince of Apostles," and therefore infallible in matters of church doctrine for the "Catholic."

BIBLE (with no "interpretation"):

The Church is Christ's church and is a living body, into which a man has to be *born again,* by a baptism of the Holy Spirit (1Cor 12:13). The man who is in Christ's "body," which is defined as the Church, does not have to worry about the Gates of Hell, for he is secure in Jesus.

ROME (with her own "interpretation"):

The Church is the Roman See, at the Vatican – the head of all Catholics who are baptized by *water* into the Universal *Roman* Church. The Catholic, in the Roman Church, can lose salvation at any time, for the promise to the church in Matthew 16:17,18 has been interpreted to apply *only to the outward, visible, perseverance of the Roman Hierarchy in history!*

BIBLE (with no "interpretation"):
Jesus is defined as the "Rock," and the only foundation upon which a man can build anything.

ROME (with her own "interpretation"):
Rome defines a cursing, Jewish fisherman as the "Rock," and in so doing has to *change the original language in which the New Testament was written by the Holy Ghost.*

BIBLE (with no "interpretation"):
The Bible never mentions "Rome" or "Roman," except in the sense of murdering God's Son and piercing His side. Nine-tenths of the New Testament is written in Asia Minor – not Rome – and Paul is careful not to mention Peter *directly or indirectly, when writing to the Roman church.*

ROME (with her own "interpretation"):
Rome – through her carnal, apostate bishops – transfers the entire Bible to a Gentile setting, although nine-tenths of the New Testament is written in Asia, and the authority goes to Paul – not to Peter. The Church presented by Paul is a heavenly, humble, witnessing, called-out group of believers – *not a political, wealthy, proud, sacramental body of world-loving traditionalists.*

Rome's first private interpretation (Matt 16:17,18) is typical of the seven that follow. It is as far from Christian interpretation and Bible interpretation as a pre-millennial sermon is from a seance.

THE SECOND PRIVATE INTERPRETATION

The second private interpretation of Rome, given without any regard for the scripture, is the remainder of the passage in Matthew 16:16-19. It reads as follows:

"And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

First, let us see what the scriptures themselves have to say about the verse, since their comments will always be clearer and more authoritative than Roman teaching on the subject.

"The keys of the kingdom of heaven"

"Woe unto you, lawyers! For ye have taken away THE KEY OF KNOWLEDGE . . . " (Luke 11:52).

"And the KEY OF THE HOUSE OF DAVID will I lay upon his shoulder; so HE SHALL OPEN, AND NONE SHALL SHUT; AND HE SHALL SHUT, AND NONE SHALL OPEN" (Isa 22:22).

"I know thy works: behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it . . . he that hath THE KEY OF DAVID . . . " (Rev 3:8,7).

"FOR A GREAT DOOR AND EFFECTUAL IS OPENED UNTO ME, and there are many adversaries" (1Cor 16:9).

"Furthermore, when I came to Troas to preach Christ's gospel, and A DOOR WAS OPENED UNTO ME of the Lord" (2Cor 2:12).

"Withal praying also for us, that God would open unto us A DOOR OF UTTERANCE, TO SPEAK THE MYSTERY OF CHRIST, for which I am also in bonds" (Col 4:3).

Observe how clearly the simple and plain words define what a "door" *is* in scripture, and how far removed they are from any conjured-up "apostolic teaching" of the "Holy Mother Church." Rome is never involved, implicated, or mentioned in the passages, and the authority in

every case is in God's hands, even after the keys are given. And the "doors" in every case have to do with *"doors of opportunity," connected with preaching.* Not once are the scriptures so foolish and blasphemous as to suggest that the keys to the kingdom of heaven have anything to do with giving anyone power to interpret anything or control anything. *The kingdom of heaven* in scripture is *always Jewish; never Roman – always Davidic; never Popish – always in a mystery form until the second advent; never in a visible political form until then – always is earthly and literal; and is never spiritual or heavenly.* (Note the references throughout either testament: Dan 2,7; Matt 2,3,10,13,25.) Paul never mentions the kingdom of heaven, and is very careful to avoid mentioning it to any born-again believer in the church, as the subject concerns *Jewish prophecy,* not Christian revelation. There is no "kingdom of heaven" found anywhere in Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, Ephesians, Timothy, Titus, Philemon, or Thessalonians. Strange indeed, is it not, that the Roman Church would pick Matthew 16:19 as a "proof text," when it is *not even connected with Christianity?*

The scriptures, therefore, that oppose Matthew 16:19 are the Pauline epistles. If any interpretation is derived from the passage in Matthew that conflicts with Pauline doctrine, then that interpretation is obviously a "private" interpretation, and not the interpretation of the Holy Spirit. In the Pauline epistles, a *door* is an opportunity to preach, and the "kingdom of heaven" is an earthly kingdom, which in this age is in such a mystery-form (Matt 13) that Paul does not even connect it with the new birth, or with the church.

Now watch Rome go to work in "interpreting," and *violate every verse* of scripture dealing with the passage, and absolutely trample to the ground any verse that helps the reader to understand the passage. The following quotations are from the booklet "C" by the Knights of Columbus.

" 'And I will give unto thee the keys . . . ' Jesus could scarcely have used stronger or plainer words to indicate that He would confer on Peter such great authority that any act of government, any rule which he should prescribe, any interpretation of the Master's teaching which he should promulgate, would be *ratified, sanctioned, and fully approved by God in heaven.*"

This monstrous blasphemy is so distorted that it is almost *funny*.

The statement is exactly as you read it; you did not read something that you only "thought" you read. (This is page 17 in the article, "The Rock that was Simon.") You read that Peter had power to make *any interpretation and prescribe any rule, and God would approve of it!!* Think of that, in view of what the scriptures say about their own power to rule and interpret themselves! (Heb 4:12; Luke 24:45; 2Pet 1:20; 1John 2:27; John 16:13). *Peter gives the wrong interpretation of scripture in Galatians 2, after the ascension, and is trounced upon by Paul for messing up correct doctrine!* (Read it in Galatians 2.) After Matthew 16:19, Peter curses and swears (Matt 26), denies Christ, argues with the Lord (Acts 10), and perverts the gospel (Gal 2) – and yet this silly publication by the Knights of Columbus states that Jesus authorized Peter (and this authorization God would also ratify) to *make any interpretation that he pleased.* What a mess!

In the Knights' "explanation," no attention has been given to the meaning of *one single word* in the passage used to "prove" the point. The passage has been lifted, piece-meal, out of the scriptures into a setting that is entirely divorced from scripture, and is given a meaning that is not found anywhere in scripture – in fact, the meaning runs contrary to the scriptures that are given. It is a perfect example of private interpretation at its worst.

In Book "D" the interpretation is even more psychotic.

"It should be noted that to Peter alone was it said that he would stabilize the church which Christ would

build so that it would not fall before the powers of evil . . . to him alone would be given the keys of the kingdom of heaven – a symbol of power and authority in the church. Thus the Saviour made *one man* the shepherd of His flock. No limitation is hinted at. The entire flock is committed to Peter's care. All these figures of speech ("key," "Rock," "shepherd," etc.) used in Christ's words to Peter express supreme authority in relation to the other apostles and the whole church. If any of the apostles were infallible, certainly Peter was, as the confirmer of his brethren and the preserver of the faith of Christ's church. Peter's successor fell heir to Peter's job, which carried with it the assurance of divine guidance and assistance, such as had been promised to Peter. This is what is meant by the infallibility of the Pope!" (From pages 14-18, "Peter, the Pope, and Infallibility.")

Read the quotation over again carefully and observe that:

1. Peter did *not* stabilize the church from Acts 10-28 – Paul did.
2. The church is *not* the kingdom of heaven; it is the body of Christ.
3. Peter did *not* classify himself as the "chief shepherd," but in 1Pet 5 (his own epistle) said that he was *"one"* of a group of elders entrusted with the feeding – and that the "chief shepherd" was *Christ.*
4. *Peter had no authority whatsoever over Paul anywhere in the New Testament at any time, and Paul was the apostle to the Romans!* (Rom 15).

The simplest, child-like, most ignorant, grade-school reader could tell any of these facts with *one* reading of the English New Testament. The private interpretation of Rome in this case is so outrageous and heathen that it is not merely "wrong interpretation," it is a fairy-tale speculation unworthy of a ten year-old Ubangi.

Rome is not only unable to exposit Matthew 16:19, she is not able to read it, or define the words being read.

The Bible facts are that Peter was a circumcised Jew, who was *erring* in doctrine, even years after the Resurrection (Acts 10, Gal 2). He was not sent to the Gentiles, but to the Jews (Gal 2). Paul straightened him out on water baptism and circumsion (Gal 2; Acts 15). The "keys" Peter used were both "opportunities" found recorded in the book of Acts (Acts 2, 10); and neither are even remotely connected in any way, shape, or form, to any kind of authority in *determining church discipline, doctrine, interpretation, rule, or tradition.* These are the facts, discernible to any reader who will take the time to read the passages; and may it be said as bluntly as possible, that any interpretation which ignores these facts is obviously the interpretation of a bold-faced liar. Whatever authority Rome derives from Matthew 16:19 is stolen, without God's permission, and is concocted by means which a normal man in his right mind could not assent to for a minute. The fact that millions do, is proof that "broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereat." Rome robs Paul to pay Peter; and yet Paul is given the revelation of the New Testament church (Eph 2,3), which Peter knew nothing about, whatsoever, until after the fifteenth chapter of the book of Acts.

1. In the scripture, a *key* is the ability to open a door; *in Roman mythology,* it is a symbol of ecclesiastical authority.
2. In the scripture, a *door* is an opportunity to preach the Gospel; *in Roman superstition,* it is the door to the church or to heaven.
3. In the scripture, the kingdom of heaven is the opening of the gospel to Jew and Gentile after Pentecost, ushering in the age when the earthly, literal, visible kingdom is in a *mystery form; in Roman tradition,* the kingdom of heaven is the Roman Catholic Church, plus the Vatican State.
4. In the scripture, the *binding and loosing* is given to more than twelve apostles (Luke 24, John 20, and Matt 18), and deals with disputes between

Christians in an assembly; *in Roman legend,* it is the *power to invent anti-Biblical dogmas and enforce them as "scripture".*

In short, the interpretation of Matthew 16:19 is the second private interpretation of Rome, and it can be ignored and even laughed at without the slightest fear whatsoever of incurring God's displeasure. "The curse causeless shall not come" (Proverbs 26:2). And the stupid and childish "anathemas" placed by Rome's councils on Bible-believers who do not adopt Rome's private interpretations, are about as God-honoured as the ravings of a gibbering idiot in a mad-house. Rome has *always had to enforce her "anathemas" with political violence, for God would never honour a one of them, spiritually.*

Before taking up the third private interpretation of Rome, let it be noticed that once Matthew 16:17-19 has been aborted from its setting, misinterpreted by the Roman bishops, and then misapplied (in violation of the teaching of the Holy Spirit), that Rome then has *authority to make any other changes she so desires.* These first two private interpretations, then, are the root and source for a thousand perversions and godless distortions of Bible truth. From here on, the interpreting of the "Holy Mother Church" becomes just an endless series of fantastic, arbitrary, heathen speculation, designed to either confuse the Catholic so he will think that the Bible is a hopeless book to understand, or else to force the Catholic into accepting the Roman Church as the interpreter instead of the Holy Spirit. No matter what Rome professes, or what her bishops and popes profess, *this is what takes place.*

THE THIRD PRIVATE INTERPRETATION

"And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained" (John 20:22,23).

Scripture-with-scripture:

" . . . without shedding of blood is NO REMISSION" (Heb 9:22).

"Now WHERE REMISSION OF THESE IS, THERE IS NO MORE OFFERING FOR SIN. And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, WHICH CAN NEVER TAKE AWAY SINS" (Heb 10:18,11).

" . . . Through this man is preached unto you THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts 13:38,39).

"In whom we have redemption through his blood, even THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS" (Col 1:14).

"For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for THE REMISSION OF SINS" (Matt 26:28).

" . . . Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for THE REMISSION OF SINS . . ." (Acts 2:38).

" . . . Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare his righteousness for THE REMISSION OF SINS THAT ARE PAST . ." (Romans 3:24,25).

A study of the passages concerned will reveal immediately how non-Christian and un-scriptural the Roman system is. Observe that in the scriptures that deal with the scripture cited, the following facts are evident *by statement*, without any "interpreting."

1. Remission of sins is BY SHED BLOOD.
2. Priests have never been able to remit anyone's sins.

3. Remission or forgiveness of sins lies in the atonement of Jesus Christ. (Hebrews 10:1-12 states that this atonement is a *one*, once-and-for-all act, never to be continued or repeated Read it!)
4. The blood is shed because God *forgave sin*, not in order to get it forgiven. Note: "sins that are past," exactly as in Hebrews 9:15. God forgave throughout the Old Testament (Ex 34:7), but could not "clear the guilty" until Matthew 26:28. Compare Hebrews 10:4.

No matter who interprets what, any interpretation that takes away the Christian truth of *one effectual sacrifice forever, to pay for sins committed from Adam to Christ, now available forever, in free remission – on the grounds of that sacrifice* – is a perversion of scripture. Before giving the scriptures that yield correct interpretation on the power given in John 20, let us turn to the Knights of Columbus (always good for a laugh), and watch them maul and rend the text until there is nothing left to it that a man could understand without a college education.

Knights of Columbus, "Yes, A Priest Can Forgive Your Sins," p. 3.

"Notice that Christ begins his sentence with a claim (John 20:22,23). They, the apostles, come from and are delegated by Him, the Son. And it is through the Holy Spirit that they receive the power to forgive sins. When sinners at any time repent, they repent through Christ. He is the central agent. But his central agent gives His apostles the power to forgive sins. *And would that make sense if forgiveness of sin demanded no intermediaries? The man whom the church authorizes to forgive sin is ALWAYS A PRIEST. He studies for the job almost twice as long as the time necessary to qualify in the legal profession, longer than the time necessary to qualify as a medical doctor.* (!) When the man is ordained a priest, it means that he shares in the Priesthood of Christ. *Through him, Christ forgives*

the sins of the penitent. Hence, the Catholic position is not one which states that non-Catholics cannot have their sins forgiven *merely because* they do not believe in Confession. Private sorrow for sin in a non-Catholic is *not something bad in itself;* but private contrition *cannot match confession,* simply because *forgiveness of sins by the church is the way that Christ has prescribed."* (!)

Now this is the teaching of the Roman Church. You will observe that the "non-Catholic" is knocked out of getting any sins forgiven, on the grounds that he does not confess to a Roman Catholic priest, under the authority of the Roman Catholic Church. Now what have the Knights of Columbus actually done to John 20:22,23 to obtain this heresy?

1. They began with the presumption that John 20:22,23 applied to *apostles only,* and yet the Bible plainly tells them that there were *"disciples"* in the room *with the apostles* when the command was given! Note, in Luke 24:33, you are told that the scene of John 20 has "the eleven gathered together, and *them that were with them."* Thus Rome has ignored the scripture comments on scripture, and has privately interpreted the group as *apostles, when the scriptures flatly state that they are "apostles" and "disciples."* A better example of private interpretation could hardly be found. In a law court, they hold a man *guilty* if he bases his defense on this kind of documentary evidence. You can be quite sure that if any man does not believe what the Catholic Church teaches about "apostolic authority" in John 20:22,23, that man is *not* "anathema" – he is, rather, a Bible-believer. No Bible-believer would ever be so stupid to say that John 20:22,23 applied to the apostles *only;* a man would have to be a "knight" to believe such nonsense!

2. When the Knight went ahead and said, "the man whom the CHURCH authorizes to forgive sin is always a priest," then the whole system is "shot to Purgatory," for John 20:22,23 *has nothing to do with a Roman Church setting up a college course for priests to study; it has to do*

with Jesus Christ giving power to disciples. Again, private interpretation is so apparent that it is appalling. The text is divorced from the comment. The subjects are neither identical, nor related. The authority is neither similar, nor equal. Christ is not the church, the priests are not apostles; and as surely as you live and breathe, a God-given command is not "study for a job twice as long as the time needed to qualify in the legal profession." To get the "interpretation" (what an abuse of lexicography!), the Catholic has had to insert "apostles" for "disciples," "Roman Catholic" for "Jesus Christ," and "study" for "breathed on them!" In short, he has had to alter the entire text with everything in it, including subject, object, predicate, and verb. We could not paraphrase Rome's famous, "If any man believe not, let him be anathema," to a man who stupidly accepted the Catholic teaching on the verse; but we could say, "If any man believe the Catholic teaching on John 20:22,23, let him attend a school for deaf mutes!"

3. The most damaging thing that any Catholic interpretation does (of its famous eight) to Christianity is the contradictions that it forces on the rest of the Bible. This is apparent when the verses that actually explain John 20:22,23 are studied, without resort to changing words, inventing symbols, pretending authority, claiming power, or inserting traditions.

a. Paul had the authority of John 20:22,23, *without* being present in the room. Notice his statement to this effect in 2Corinthians 2:10.

b. This power is illustrated in Acts 13:38,39, where every Christian has the right to tell any man that he is *forgiven* or *not forgiven,* on the basis of what he does with Jesus Christ (2Cor 2:16).

c. Since *all Christians are "priests,"* called to offer *spiritual sacrifices* (Heb 3:1; 13:15; 1Pet 2:1-5), it is most certain that no Roman Catholic priest ever had any more power to "remit and retain" than the most ignorant, born-again, Protestant farmer. (Notice Revelation 1:6, and

observe that at no time does any Christian ever have to "interpret" anything; all he has to do is *read.)*

d. Since there is not one verse in a Bible indicating that there is *any priesthood* in the New Testament except a priesthood of born-again believers (1Pet 2), then the entire system of two million priests is utterly *non-Biblical, non-Christian,* and *non-New Testament,* from top to bottom.

The Knight says, "When a man is ordained a priest, it means that he shares in the priesthood of Christ. Whatever the priest can do, he can act as a priest only because Christ acts *through* him . . . through him Christ forgives the sins of the penitent" (Ibid., p. 4).

Unfortunately for the Knight, there are *no priests ordained* in the New Testament – married "bishops" and married "elders" are ordained (Titus 1; Acts 14; 1Pet 5; 1Tim 3), but there is no ordination, *spiritual or ceremonial,* for a "Priest." When the high priest enters the veil (Heb 8-10), the veil has been rent (Matt 27), *abolishing a "priestly class" of "priests."* Again, no one interprets anything. Every word is written out exactly, and the only way to obtain the Roman reading is to resort to the private interpretation of the Roman bishops and popes, who seek to justify their hierarchy. Christ acts through Christians (Phil 4; 2Cor 5; 1Cor 3,6,9), who are "priests" – the black-robed fathers who worship the Queen of Heaven are found in the Old Testament; not in the New. The Christian has the Lord Jesus *inside* his body, and he, himself, is *"in Christ"* (2Cor 5; 1Cor 12; Eph 2,3), and is a priest who can intercede for the lost – even deluded, self-righteous, Bible-perverting Catholic "priests"!

In the third private interpretation, the Roman has erected a whole class of people for the purpose of abrogating and denying the great central truth of the New Testament – that all born-again Christians are priests in Christ and deal with God directly, through Him, without the need of any nut in a Halloween costume lighting candles and muttering Latin for them. An old Negro down

South, being proselyted by Catholics, was told, "But Sam, you need to join the church that has the *keys.* Jesus gave Simon Peter the *keys!"* "Shucks, man," said the old darky, "Ah doan need dem keys! *Ah gots de doah!"* (John 10:9) (Keep your keys, honey; we Christians have the door – door-mat, knobs, lock, key, sill, frame, panels, and all!)

THE FOURTH PRIVATE INTERPRETATION

The fourth private interpretation of Rome deals with what constitutes a Bible and what does not. It is a matter of common knowledge that the Roman Bible contains forty-six books in the Old Testament, whereas the Reformation Bible contains thirty-nine. This disparagement has caused modernists and infidels great opportunity to question whether the correct canon should not contain anywhere from fifty to a hundred extra books, ranging from Jubilee Mythology to Enoch's Fables. The text used by Rome to prove that her forty-six books are the correct canon, is found in John; and it is used in conjunction with one found in 1Timothy. They read as follows:

"And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen" (John 21:25).

" . . . the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth" (1Tim 3:15).

Before aligning the scriptures that comment on these scriptures, let it be noticed that the passage in John is hypothetical from start to finish (a perfect foundation-truth for a Catholic!): "If they should . . . I suppose . . . that should be . . . " This is typical of the "starting places" that Romans favor. The scriptures themselves immediately circumscribe these "ifs" and "supposes" with the following *clear* passages:

"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, IF ANY MAN SHALL ADD UNTO THESE THINGS, GOD SHALL ADD UNTO HIM THE PLAGUES THAT ARE WRITTEN IN THIS BOOK: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book" (Rev 22:18,19).

"ALL SCRIPTURE IS GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (2Tim 3:16).

"Every word of God is pure . . . ADD THOU NOT UNTO HIS WORDS, LEST HE REPROVE THEE, AND THOU BE FOUND A LIAR" (Prov 30:5,6).

" . . . thou hast tried THEM WHICH SAY THEY ARE APOSTLES, AND ARE NOT, and hast found them liars" (Rev 2:2).

"FOR WE ARE NOT AS MANY, WHICH CORRUPT THE WORD OF GOD: but as of sincerity, BUT AS OF GOD, in the sight of God speak we in Christ" (2Cor 2:17).

"For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because WHEN YE RECEIVED THE WORD OF GOD WHICH YE HEARD OF US, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe" (1Thes 2:13).

There are three warnings about adding things to the Bible – they are placed at the end of the first five books (Deut 4:2), directly in the middle (Prov 30:6), and right at the end of the last book (Rev 22:18,19). This clear truth makes it abundantly plain that even if other books "I suppose might be written about what Jesus did," they were *not* inspired, and at the time Paul began writing his first epistles (Cor, Thes), the only Word of God available was the Old Testament – thirty-nine books. Or was it forty-six?

The whole trouble centers around whether or not the Old Testament contained seven books called "the Apocrypha." These seven books are considered canonical by Rome, and the Catholic Church has already officially cursed every human being, *including Jesus Christ,* who refuses to accept their seven books as "inspired of the Holy Spirit." We shall examine this private interpretation in a moment, but first of all, notice the evidence presented by the scriptures themselves, about themselves, independent of Roman speculation.

1. All scripture is inspired.
2. The scriptures are the work of the Holy Spirit (2Pet 1:21).
3. They are the Word of God, and not the word of priests and popes.
4. Many corrupt them, but Paul and his company did not.
5. Those who corrupt them claimed apostolic succession, but were liars; and they were proved liars by the fact that they *added* to the Word of God.
6. They are promised, for their religious labors as "guardians of the scripture," *all the plagues that are written in the book!*

Now watch the Roman handling of the passages as she attempts to usurp the authority of the author of scripture, and force the author to write something He never wrote!

"The Bible bears witness to the fact that the Mosaic legislation was not completed by the great law-giver. We see, then, that the *written* law had to be supplemented by a *living authority*. The principle of a living authority could not be more clearly and forcefully stated, and the need for the common good of submitting to that authority, could not be given a sterner sanction." (This reference is given in explanation of Deuteronomy 17:8-12, where Old Testament Jews under the Law, were given judges and priests to settle disputes that arose in connection with the Law.) "The Bible is *Not* our Sole Guide," Knights of Columbus, p. 8-11.

"The statement of Christ (in the sermon on the mount) that He did not come to destroy the Old but to perfect it, indicates that the same *general religious system or method would remain in force"* (!) (p. 13).

"St. Peter gives the reason for ruling out *private interpretation* and recognizing *only the official* (!) interpretation as the safe guide. St. Peter warns the people that they need a guide, that scripture required to be "opened," was the universal belief of the primitive Church. They were

opened by Christ, or His ministers, or by Apollos. *The determination of what the Bible should contain could never have been achieved except by the living voice of the authoritative church* (Roman Catholic!), *the pillar and ground of truth, the body of Christ!"*

The reasoning is, first of all, that there has to be a *living authority* to interpret the Bible in the Old Testament, and since this living authority is vested in an Old Testament "church," with Levitical priests under the Law, that the New Testament church has to have priests and an organization to properly give the *official* interpretation. In keeping with this, it is presumed that the Roman Catholic Church, *alone,* is the only body of Christians who are able to tell what belongs in scripture, what does not, and how the scriptures are to be interpreted if they are classified as "scriptures."

Now, laying the Knights of Columbus literature alongside of scripture (which we are told to do – "prove all things," "try the spirits," etc.), observe first of all that the Old Testament Levitical priesthood, *with its judges, is permanently done away with at Calvary!* (2Cor 3, Gal 3, Heb 3-8,10). The Catholic, following his traditional system of private interpretation has quoted "The Sermon on the Mount," given to Jews, before the resurrection, as the proof-text that the Old Testament organized authority still exists! Wrong again – we are not on the other side of Calvary; we are *this* side of it.

The passages in Hebrews 10 are so brutally anti-Catholic, that they have been torn out of Manuscript "B," Vaticanus, which is the standard authority for the Westcott and Hort text of the RSV, ASV, and RV. But there is no priest class left to interpret anything, and the Old Testament governing body, which murdered God's Son in keeping with official interpretation (John 18, 19), was obliterated. The "Knights" have forced the Catholic back into a system that God has abrogated, and the appeal to the "Sermon on the Mount" shows the ignorance and dishonesty of the Roman See – *nothing in the sermon is*

given to any New Testament, born-again Christian anywhere on the face of the earth. As a matter of scientific fact, the word "Christian" does not occur anywhere in the Bible until Acts 11, and the "church" is found nowhere in the Sermon on the Mount. Those addressed are temple-attending, pork-abstaining, Old Testament, Sabbath-observing *Jews.* Wrong application. Wrong reading. Wrong interpretation. Wrong teaching. And wrong faith. Rome could not be more in the wrong if she tried.

"Wherefore THE LAW WAS OUR SCHOOLMASTER TO BRING US UNTO CHRIST, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are NO LONGER UNDER A SCHOOLMASTER" (Gal 3:24, 25).

" . . . whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace" (Gal 5:4).

"Knowing this, that THE LAW IS NOT MADE FOR A RIGHTEOUS MAN, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane . . . and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine" (1Tim 1:9,10).

"For sin shall not have dominion over you: FOR YE ARE NOT UNDER THE LAW, but under grace" (Rom 6:14).

"But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenence; WHICH GLORY WAS TO BE DONE AWAY . . . FOR IF THAT WHICH IS DONE AWAY was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious" (2Cor 3:7, 11).

"Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, AND TOOK IT OUT OF THE WAY, nailing it to his cross . . . Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an HOLYDAY, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days . . . Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, VAINLY

PUFFED UP BY HIS FLESHLY MIND" (Col 2:14–18).

Again, the Ebionite tendencies of the Roman bishops have them in bad trouble. To maintain an Old Testament priesthood and "official interpretation" of an authoritative body, they have gone to the sermon on the mount, *instead of the Pauline epistles,* for their doctrines. Nothing could reveal more clearly the deliberate and intentional desire to pervert the Word of God than this device; for, over and over again, we are told by the Holy Ghost, Himself, that the future revelation, which Christ did not give to the Jews during His earthly ministry, was revealed to Paul (John 16:12; Rom 15:8,16).

In the first century of church history, before there were any "Catholics," and when the word "Rome" was synonymous with "Satan's seat," the teachings of the Ebionites were considered heresy. An Ebionite was one who *rejected the New Testament revelation of salvation by the grace of God, and confined his theology to the "sayings of Jesus," as principles whereby a fallen man could earn eternal life by his own works.* This is the foundation of the Knights of Columbus' passage, cited above – it is founded upon *perversion* of the revelation of God.

Notice further the ludicrous statement: *"St. Peter warns the people that they need a guide."* (!) And then, without any warning, or without one glance at the Bible, the words *"Roman Catholic Church"* are inserted as the required "guide"! And yet, nowhere does the Bible in either testament, even suggest or hint that Romans or Catholics are anywhere near enough to the truth to guide anyone. The guide, which the Bible clearly marks and defines, is the Holy Spirit, Himself!

"Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, HE WILL GUIDE you into all truth . . . " (John 16:13).

"Then opened He (Jesus) their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures," (Luke 24:45).

"But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you:

but the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in Him" (1John 2:27).

Observe how deftly and concisely the scriptures *smear* the Roman Catholic hierarchy as a *"guide."* The Holy Spirit, Himself, representing the Lord Jesus, Himself, indwells the body of the believer, so that he has the *infallible guide inside his body!* (1Cor 3:16; Col 1:6-9). (Where Christians differ in doctrine or refuse to abide by the truth, there is always something personal and subjective in the life of the individual believer – either lack of Bible study, lack of prayer, or lack of surrender to revealed light. Not once, however, is the born-again believer with the completed scriptures at his disposal, ever told to look to Rome for any spiritual help or advice about anything. He would do just as well to look in a garbage can for it, as far as the scriptures are concerned.)

Rome has arrogantly presumed that the "infallible guide" (the Holy Spirit), is to be found *only in the bodies of its Catholic membership!* Hence the peculiar statement that the "opening" of the eyes was performed by "Christ, His ministers, or Apollos." See above. It is taken for granted that since Matthew 16:16-19 has already been forced to prove Roman authority, that no one but a *Roman Catholic* would have the power that Christ, His ministers, or Apollos had! Unfortunately, the Holy Spirit has taught more *scripture truth* through Paul, Peter, James, Chrysostom, Luther, Calvin, Larkin, Pember, DeHaan, Peters, Bullinger, Sauer, Wesley, and Lange, than He ever did through the "catholic" Augustine, Jerome, Eusebius, Irenaeus, Origen, Lanselm, Abelard, and Aquinas. All these men did was *agree with the private interpretations heretofore mentioned,* which have already been proved to be wholly *"private,"* that is, completely *independent* of scripture revelation or Bible comment.

But the "Stalingrad" of Rome's attitude toward canonical books and "books that should have been written, if . . . ," comes in the closing statement of the

Knights, already cited: *"The determination of what the Bible should contain could never have been achieved except by the living voice of the authoritative church* (Roman Catholic), *the pillar and ground of truth, the body of Christ!"*

Watch carefully now and you will see one of the most amazing side-show acts of buffoonery ever put on the religious stage. Keep in mind throughout, that here, as in the councils, the Roman Church has claimed for herself the absolute authority to determine what books should be in a Bible, and what ones should not.

a. All Roman Catholics believe the Bible contains seventy-three books.
b. All Bible-believers believe the Bible contains sixty-six books.
c. All Orthodox Jews believe the Bible contains thirty-nine books.
d. To get his seventy-three, the Catholic adds seven books to the Old Testament thirty-nine.

Who is right?

Now the Catholic Church claims absolute authoritative power to prove that *she is always right, and never wrong, in canonical matters.* She believes this to the extent that she will officially *curse* any man who does not believe that there are forty-six books in the Old Testament and twenty-seven in the New. Here is the statement, produced verbatim, in perfect keeping with exact, nihil obstat, Catholic, ex-cathedra, Papal authority:

"The sacred and holy, ecumenical, and general Synod of Trent – lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost – receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books of the Old and New Testaments . . . and it has thought it meet that a list of the sacred books be inserted in this decree, lest a doubt may arise in anyone's mind, which are the books that are received of this synod. They are set down here below: of the Old Testament – the five books of Moses: to wit, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy;

Josue, Judges, Ruth, Four Books of Kings, Two of Paralipomenon (Chronicles), the First Book of Esdras, and the Second which is entitled Nehemias; Tobias, Judith, Esther, Job, the Davidical Psalter, consisting of a hundred and fifty psalms; the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Canticle of Canticles (Song), Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Isaias, Jeremias, with Baruch; Ezechiel, Daniel, the Twelve Minor Prophets; to wit, Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggaeus, Zacharias, Malachias; the Two Books of the Machabees, the First and the Second." (And therewith follows the list of the twenty-seven New Testament books.)

"If anyone receive not, as sacred and canonical, the said books entire, with all their parts, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and as they are contained in the Old Latin Vulgate edition: and knowingly and deliberately contemn the traditions aforesaid: let him be anathema (cursed)" (Council of Trent, Fourth Session, April 8, 1546).

It is apparent at once that all Bible-believers, Jewish and Protestant alike, are *under a curse.* The Jew says thirty-nine books in the Old Testament; the Bible-believer says thirty-nine; and the Roman Pope says forty-six!!

Now before laying out the Bible evidence on this tomfoolery, would you please pay careful attention to the lengths to which a Catholic will go to enforce his own private interpretation. The Pope has stated (all councils, bishops, archbishops, priests, nuns and monks agreeing) that anyone who does not believe that the proper canon of scripture is forty-six books in the Old Testament – Tobias, Judith, etc. – *is to be cursed.* Wouldn't it be a riot if the Lord Jesus Christ only recognized thirty-nine?

" . . . no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed . . . " (1Cor 12:3).

Don't hedge about "interpretations." Face the facts like a big, grown-up boy! Rome has officially stated that any man who does not accept their seven apocryphal books in the Old Testament, is *accursed.* This means that

the author of this booklet you are now reading *is accursed*, in spite of the fact that "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (Gal 3:13). Don't put the booklet down; go on to the bitter end! If it can be showed absolutely that there are thirty-nine books in the Old Testament which Jesus recognized (and no more than thirty-nine), then this big, half-baked, religious upstart called the Roman Catholic Church had better depend on bullets, ballets, and lobbyists to enforce her doctrines, for *she has no SPIRITUAL power from God.*

The point is, can any church that claims to be the "body of Christ" (see above), *officially curse Jesus Christ, and then reject His authoritative teaching on the canon of scripture?* How could such a curse even *mention* "the Holy Ghost"?

FACT ONE: The oracles of God in the Old Testament were given to Israel, and not to Rome (Rom 3:2). They are not written in Latin, or "The Vulgate."

FACT TWO: All Orthodox Jews in 1969 (as in 400 B.C.), accept thirty-nine books as canonical. All were written by Jews. No Roman wrote a single book.

FACT THREE A Jewish Old Testament in 1969 (as in 400 B.C.), begins with Genesis and ends with 2Chronicles. This is a matter of historical records which can be proved in court.

FACT FOUR: No Orthodox Jew ever accepted *one book* of the seven listed by Rome as belonging to the canon, and the Greek version of the Old Testament (LXX, Septuagint), *did not contain these seven books at the time it was written.* (Josephus testifies to this, as do numerous others.)

FACT FIVE: A Hebrew Old Testament, written in Hebrew, by Hebrews, contains three sections (the Torah, the Nabhim, and the Kethubim). These three sections are called "the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings (or Psalms)." The books contained in these three sections are

as follows, with no subtractions or additions from 400 B.C. to 1960 A.D.:

The Torah: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy.

The Nabhim: Joshua, Judges, 1&2Samuel, 1&2Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Haggai, Habbakuk, Zechariah, Malachi.

The Kethubim: Psalm, Proverbs, Job, Song, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, 1&2Chronicles.

This is the canon of the Old Testament, fixed by the Holy Spirit four hundred years *before* Christ said: "I *will* build my church." *Tobit, Judith, etc. are not in it.* When Peter wrote "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," he referred to these scriptures. When Paul said "all scripture is inspired by God," he was referring to these scriptures. When Jesus said "Thy word is truth," He referred to these scriptures. When He made His canonical statement in Luke 24:44, He referred to these scriptures; and in that canonical statement He said: " . . . all things must be fulfilled, which were written in *the law of Moses* and in *the Prophets*, and in *the Psalms*, concerning me!" (Luke 24:44)

How quaint that Jesus should make an official, ex-cathedra, infallible, Roman interpretation of the Old Testament, and yet recognize only the three sections of Hebrew scripture used by *every Hebrew* from 400 B.C. to 1960 A.D.! How nasty and irreverent of Him not to recognize the Holy Papa's little statement, *"If any man receive not as sacred and canonical . . . "!* What do you suppose possessed Jesus Christ to just *stamp* all over the official teaching of the "Holy Mother Church" in regard to the canon?

But this is only the beginning of the matter. As the Knights rush to the apocrypha to pull out spurious passages which *resemble* New Testament passages (in an effort to prove that the apostles used the apocrypha!),

Jesus messes everything up with the following:

"That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, FROM THE BLOOD OF RIGHTEOUS ABEL UNTO THE BLOOD OF ZACHARIAS SON OF BARACHIAS, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar" (Matt 23:35).

This brings the "Cat(holic)" out of the bag, and a black cat it is! Abel is killed in Genesis; Zacharias is killed 2Chronicles. That is, the complete circumference of the Old Testament canon is circumscribed in one arc that lands *not at Maccabees* (see Catholic canon in Council of Trent statement), *but at Second Chronicles, which was the last book in a Hebrew Bible from 400 B.C. to 1960 A.D.!*

Now who are you going to curse?

The Lord Jesus Christ would have said of the infallible "guide" at Trent: "They be blind leaders of the blind. If the blind guide the blind, they shall both fall into the ditch." Jesus never accepted the Roman Catholic Bible as canonical. He does not now. His own absolute, infallible, authoritative decrees, as head of the entire church, recognize the thirty-nine books of all Orthodox Jews and Bible-believing Christians. And Rome supposes that these are to be *"anathema"?* Phooey! "The curse causeless shall not come" (Prov 26:2).

If we were as morose and as bitter and as vindictive as the silly popes and priests, we would have every right (in view of Jesus' statements) to say: "If any man add seven books to the Old Testament, which books the Lord Jesus ignored, let him be cursed." But fortunately, we who have the joy of salvation and assurance of heaven, are in too good a humour to kick a cripple. Shall we not rather say, as Paul: "If any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant" (1Cor 14:38).

The fourth private interpretation of Rome ends in a Stalingrad for every "Catholic" who is stupid enough to obey "Mother Church." Mother Church, as the monstrosity in Revelation 17:1-6, has no more consideration for the authority of Jesus Christ than for Luther's

"Bondage of the Will." Jesus Christ's Bible is *not* Rome's Bible, and Rome's Bible is not His – and Rome has already officially *cursed* every man who does not accept her Bible as the correct one. What a situation! To top it off, the Knights of Columbus pen the following words in "The Bible is *Not* our Sole Guide," pages 5-7:

"Its (Israel's) official literature was the Old Testament. The Jews, of course, did not have the Bible *in its entirety, such as it is known to us today.* It did not contain the New Testament books, twenty-seven in number . . . for these books had not yet been written. They had only what today we call the Old Testament. The Jews had a profound reverence for the scriptures in our Lord's time. It was a *divine revelation, and as such was the final and absolute authority; but it was not final and absolute in the sense that it excluded the possibility of further additions and the revelation of new truth as time went on."*

This winds up the fourth private interpretation exactly. To put it within the grasp of documented evidence, it comes out as follows:

1. The Catholic Church has power to determine what is truth and what is not truth.
2. She gets this power from Jesus Christ.
3. The Jewish Old Testament was not complete at the time of Christ, even though Christ quoted it as being so.
4. The Old Testament needed seven books added to it by the Roman Catholic Church, which no Jew ever accepted as "Scripture."
5. This addition is based on the fact that the Roman Church claims absolute authority to determine what should be added.
6. This authority is derived from Jesus Christ.
7. Jesus Christ had already fixed the limits of the Old Testament canon before the words "Catholic" and "Roman" were ever used in a Christian sense.
8. But He was mistaken, as proved by the fact that Rome *added seven books – and cursed anyone who*

refused to recognize them as officially canonical.

9. Even though He (Jesus) was mistaken, He still had enough truth left in Him to authorize the Roman Catholic Church to *correct His mistakes,* in matters of Old Testament canon.

10. In short, Rome only comes to the scripture to derive authority for the purpose of confounding and contradicting the scripture. She claims that this authority is from Christ; and then uses this authority to deny Christ's authority.

Conclusion: No Catholic who ever followed all the teachings of his Church, had any more idea what he was talking about, when discussing the Bible, than a drunken Communist. *You cannot quote an authority for proof when you have the authority to deny the authority that you quote.* This maxim is legally, politically, religiously, scientifically, factually, socially, morally, and psychologically sound; and Rome's denial of it is proof that her leaders are religious paranoids, bordering on the level of psychotics. The fourth private interpretation is so "private" that it is divorced from the normal level of sanity.

The first four private interpretations of Rome are designed to give her the liberty to *distort and pervert* any other passages necessary to prove that her own religion is the true religion. All following private interpretations hinge on these four, which have been so construed that Rome now has power to pick up a Bible and *change* its contents, misapply it to history, force all professing Christians to acknowledge Rome's power (and not the Holy Spirit's), and then *force the Holy Spirit* into one channel, which He never chose nor mentioned. With four perversions established as correct "Christian" doctrine, the door is wide open to admit any two or four-legged monstrosity that wants to kill sheep; and like the tree in Matthew 13, the old harlot of Revelation 17 becomes a roosting place for every kind of *fowl and bird of the heavens.* With no Holy Spirit to guide her, God against her for officially cursing His Son at the Council of Trent, and

Christ Himself giving Paul a revelation *contrary* to Roman Catholic teaching, Rome finds herself left with nothing but a huge, vast, and sprawling political organization which merely *uses* the profession of Christianity as a means of earthly dominion.

THE FIFTH PRIVATE INTERPRETATION

The fifth private interpretation of Rome is in connection with the following verses from Matthew 26:

"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed IT, and brake IT, and gave IT to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave IT to them, saying, Drink ye all of IT; For this is My blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt 26:26-28).

Before examining the Roman private interpretation of the passage (which, as all Roman interpretation, is arrived at by either ignoring the scriptures or misapplying the scriptures), let us see what the scriptures, themselves, have to say about the passage.

"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: And when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat: THIS IS MY BODY, WHICH IS BROKEN FOR YOU: this do in remembrance of me . . . For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, YE DO SHEW THE LORD'S DEATH TILL HE COME. Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord . . . For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, NOT DISCERNING THE LORD'S BODY" (1Cor 11:23-29).

"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? FOR WE BEING MANY ARE ONE BREAD, AND ONE BODY . . . " (1Cor 10:16,17).

"For by one spirit are we all baptized INTO ONE BODY . . . " (1Cor 12:13).

" . . . THE CHURCH, WHICH IS HIS BODY, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all" (Eph 1:22,23).

"Wherefore HENCEFORTH KNOW WE NO MAN

AFTER THE FLESH: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, YET NOW HENCEFORTH KNOW WE HIM NO MORE" (2Cor 5:16).

Instead of running to John 6 (a pre-crucifixion Jewish discourse), as any first century Ebionite would do, we have quoted the *exact* matching and fitting passages, where the prince of the apostles and chief, Paul, writing to Gentile Christians in Europe, describes the purpose and meaning of the Paschal Supper. Note that the *"Body* of Christ," in the Pauline epistles (where it deals with the Communion), is never the earthly, fleshy body of a dead Saviour – everywhere it is always the *risen body of a living Lord.* Furthermore, this risen body *has no blood* (1Cor 15:50; Luke 24:39), and it is composed of people, who are *flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone* (Eph 5:30). The "body" taken at communion is a risen body of believers, who have been crucified, dead, buried, and risen with Christ (Rom 6:1-6). Not by the wildest stretch of the depraved imagination could this body be the *pre-crucifixion* body of a physical Jew, about to be crucified.

And that isn't the worst of it. The post-resurrection communion, or Lord's Supper, is said to be a *remembrance of Christ,* showing His death "till He come" (1Cor 11). Yet in the Pope's "Peace Plan" given to the entire world in 1963, *not one mention was made of the second coming, which is the second thing mentioned in connection with the "Catholic Mass"* – "ye do shew His death, till He come"! Odd, is it not, that the most important doctrine taught in the Roman Church should not be remembered, even when it deals with *the only hope of permanent peace?* Someone has a short-circuit somewhere!

That isn't all. Paul makes it absolutely certain that no Christian is any more occupied with the earthly Jew who sat at the table in Matthew 26. He knows no man "after the flesh", and his present pre-occupation with Christ is with affections on things "above, things which are unseen and eternal" (Col 3:1-4; 2Cor 4:16-18). No born-again believer is occupied with a piece of bread and a jug of

liquor, trying to pretend that it is Jesus Christ's *dead* body!

That isn't the end yet. The passage in 1Corinthians 11:29 says that a man who does not discern the Lord's body is *damned (accursed* – the favorite Catholic word!). The whole issue, then, is so important that it is actually imperative for a Christian to find out what is the Lord's body and what is not. If he fails to *discern* it, the passage says that he eats and drinks damnation to himself every time he partakes of Communion! Failure, then, to believe the revelation of the Holy Spirit, speaking with the absolute authority of God, would be a disaster. If the Holy Spirit gave one revelation to the Holy Papa at the Roman "See" and another to the Apostle Paul, someone is doing a bad job of imitating Christianity. Who could it be? How could it be Angello Gieuseppi Rancalli, when he had the absolute power of "the vicar of Christ on earth"? How could an Italian winoe be mistaken, even if he contradicted the scriptures given to Paul by the Holy Spirit? (2Pet 3:15). Paul states that the body is the church; the church is the body; the communion is the communion of this body; the body is "flesh and bones," but not "flesh and blood." The body is a body risen with a risen Saviour, called to an heavenly inheritance, and it is *not* occupied with Christ's earthly ministry to Israel and Peter.

Now watch the great private interpreter go to work and slaughter the passage so that *no one can discern the Lord's body,* and subsequently none can escape the scriptural damnation, promised in 1Corinthians 11:29, by the Holy Spirit Himself – not merely by some supercilious council of over-fed bachelors!

"Forasmuch as . . . there was need . . . God so ordaining . . . He, our God and Lord, though He was about to offer Himself once on the altar of the cross unto God the Father, by means of His death, there to operate an eternal redemption; nevertheless, because that His priesthood was not to be extinguished by His death, in the last supper, on the night in which He was betrayed – that He

might leave, to His own beloved spouse, the church, a visible sacrifice, such as the nature of man requires, whereby that bloody sacrifice, once accomplished on the cross, might be represented, and memory thereof remain even unto the end of the world . . . He offered up to God the Father His own body and blood, under the species of bread and wine; He delivered His own body and blood to be received by His apostles . . . He commanded them and THEIR SUCCESSORS IN THE PRIESTHOOD to offer them even as the CATHOLIC CHURCH has always understood and taught."

"And forasmuch as in this divine sacrifice which is celebrated in the mass, that same Christ is contained and IMMOLATED in an UNBLOODY manner, Who once offered Himself in a BLOODY MANNER on the altar of the cross: the Holy Synod teaches that this sacrifice is truly PROPITIATORY, and that by means thereof this is effected, that we obtain mercy, and find grace . . . for the victim is one and the same, the same now offered by the ministry of the priests, who then offered Himself on the cross, THE MANNER ALONE OF OFFERING BEING DIFFERENT. (!) Wherefore, not only for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities of the faithful, who are living, but also for those who are departed in Christ, and who are not as yet fully purified, is it rightly offered, agreeably to A TRADITION OF THE APOSTLES" (!) (Council of Trent, 22nd Session, September 17, 1562).

Before commenting on this glaring non-Christian interpretation, let us see how the Knights of Columbus misinterpret the passages.

"In His death (Jesus') His blood was separated from His body. When these words (Matt 26) in the mass are repeated, the bread and wine *are separately changed into the body and blood of the Lord"* (!!) (Knights of Columbus, "The Holy Sacrifice," p.5).

"Dying on the cross, Christ was both priest and victim . . . when He instituted the memorial of His death at

the Last Supper, Christ also acted as a priest and offered sacrifice . . . *under the appearance of bread,* His body would be offered in sacrifice to save the world . . . Christ Himself, *under the appearance of bread and wine,* by separately changing *the bread and wine into His body and blood,* He signified the way in which He was at that moment making the surrender of His life, which He was soon to make on the cross . . . and when there is mass in the Catholic Church today, this same sacrifice is continued" (!) (p.11). "The victim is present. The separate *changing of bread and wine into His body and blood* represents the surrender of His life . . . In the mass, it is Christ who offers Himself, through the ministry of a man chosen and appointed for that purpose."

"Thus the Cross, the Last Supper, and the Mass are one and the same sacrifice. These three sacrifices have the same victim, and *the same priest* (!!), and the same offering" (p. 11-12).

"Wherever the Last Supper is *reproduced* by those whom He appointed to do so, it is the same sacrifice."

"It is true that Christ atoned for all the sins of men by His one sacrifice. By His death on the cross, Christ, as it were, *established a 'treasury of merit'* (!). We have access to that treasury of merit by means of the (Roman Catholic) mass and Christ's (Roman Catholic) sacraments. Each of us, now alive, must take Christ's sacrifice unto himself and make it his own. We personally must take that sacrifice and present it – *represent* it (!) – to God. This act (Mass), therefore, cannot be a sacrifice and the self-same sacrifice as that offered upon Calvary. The one offered is the same. The one making the offering is the same, *but* using the human priest as his instrument (!). The only difference between the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacrifice of Calvary is that on the cross, Christ's blood was actually shed; whereas in the mass, we have a memorial sacrifice in which *the shedding of blood is represented"* (pp. 13,14,15).

Before laying this heathen speculation alongside the

Holy Scriptures, let us note carefully what the Council and the Knights have said. Observe first of all, the peculiar word *"represent"* stuck in every time, just in time to save the Catholic from believing that the cup *is actually Christ's literal blood.* The unbloody sacrifice is just like the bloody – except there is no blood. This is no over-simplification of the doctrine.

In her first four private interpretations, Rome gave abundant evidence of deliberately confusing a plain issue, and intentionally complicating a simple fact, in order to force people to come to her for the explanation. (Medical doctors have used the same stunt for years!)

Instead of just swallowing this trot-line – hook, intestines, loop-knot, and all – let us lay all three sacrifices side-by-side and *see* if they are the same. (All Christians were commanded by God to "search the Scriptures," "try the spirits," "try them that say they are apostles," "reason together," and "prove all things" – and if a Christian cannot bear to critically examine the mass, he certainly is a sorry and carnal type of "believer.")

I. THE CROSS.

1. The priests are jeering at Christ and making fun of Him (Matt 26).
2. Those called "Father" are among the murderers (Matt 23).
3. The offering is *blood* and it is *bloody*. The main part of it is *blood*, and without *blood* it is totally ineffectual (Heb 9:14,22).
4. The Victim is flesh and bones and blood – body, soul, and spirit – literally and visibly present as the "Son of Man". (Matthew 27; John 19).
5. The only church present is an authoritative body of "official interpreters," who have murdered God's Son in order to keep their traditions. (Mark 7:1-13).
6. The apostles, with the exception of John, have all fled; and Peter, the "rock," is out in a prayer-meeting, trying to get a priest to absolve him for

"cussin"! (Matthew 26:56-58, 69-75).

7. This sacrifice is said to be "once for all," "one time forever," and it is compared favorably with the ineffectual priesthood of the priests of the Old Testament, who were a class of people. (Heb 10:1-6).

II. THE LORD'S SUPPER.

1. The priests are not present; only the apostles are.
2. There is no church building, no altar, and none are Gentiles.
3. There is no "Pope," no robed priests, no Latin, and no cross.
4. *The physical, literal body of Jesus is sitting, and is not "separately changed" into anything,* for He goes right on talking with them while they are eating.
5. There is no blood shed. It is an unbloody memorial, and "without shedding of blood is *no remission"* (Heb 9:22).
6. The disciples drank *all* of the "fruit of the vine," and it is *not* called "wine."
7. The supper is said to be repeated as a "memorial" – *never as a sacrifice"* (1Cor 11).
8. A *repetition* is not a *"continuation,"* and a *"continuation"* is not a *"repetition."* The only way a corrupt, godless rascal would confound these words, would be with malice aforethought, and a subjective intention to *confuse and distort a plain teaching.* You "continue" to live; but you do not "repeat" life. A "repetition" is a thing re-done again; a "continuation" is the stretched out, historical progression of a *past* reality. The Supper is *"repeated,"* but never *"continued,"* for all twelve apostles *quit eating, quit the table, stop the conversation, and leave the room at the end of it!*

III. THE MASS (neither a Christian word nor a Biblical word).

1. The priests present are unauthorized, except by

the private interpretation of Rome; and this is contrary to the clear teaching of scripture, which is self-interpreting.

2. The priests present are sinners – not the Sinless One who died.
3. The priests present *do not believe in the authority of the One who died, when He speaks of what constitutes the Word of God and what doesn't!*
4. *The sacrifice is bloodless,* by its own admission; and therefore is absolutely ineffectual to do anything.
5. *The literal, physical victim is not present, but is seated at the right hand of the majesty in the heavens* (Heb 3:1-4; 8:1; 12:1,2).
6. The risen body did *not* contain blood; therefore any reproduction of it (and *"reproduce" is the word used by the Knights* – see above) is totally ineffectual and absolutely worthless in regard to any thing connected with *forgiveness of sins.*
7. Judas is not present, as in the Lord's Supper (or is he?). The priests have no apostolic signs and wonders, which are the "signs of an apostle" (2Cor 12:12). They speak in Latin, not in Greek. Their Bible is not a "Holy Bible," but a God-forsaken "Apocrypha." The cup they offer is fermented liquor, and not "the fruit of the vine." And if that were not enough, the entire Mass was based upon the supposition that a Roman Catholic priest has not only the power of Peter *(who did not offer the victim!),* but also the power of Jesus Christ, Himself, *to atone for sin and forgive it.* For if the Mass is only effectual for atonement when in the hands of a Roman Catholic "priest" (and all assent that this is so), and the benefits of the atonement can only be partaken of through a Roman Catholic priest (and all assent that this is so), then Jesus Christ has deposited eternal salvation in the hands of a bunch of people who have

officially cursed Him for not believing that their Bible was His Bible! What a mess!

Now no one gets into a mess like this without a scriptural alibi. All heretics appeal to scripture as the authority. And this is one of the things that makes Romanism so subtile and effective, for few people anymore are sincere enough or honest enough to study the Word of God. Consequently, it is as easy to pawn off a lie now, as it was between 500 and 1500 A.D.

Lest anyone reading this book should make the fatal error of willful agnosticism (to prevent God from "reaching him"), let us lay out the Jesuit and Latin teaching on the mass, from the previously mentioned statement, and compare them with scripture.

1. Christ died to *"operate* an eternal redemption" (Trent). Note the wording, "to operate." This thrusts into the divine plan an added factor not found in the New Testament. John 3:16; 5:24; 3:36; Romans 10:9,10; Ephesians 2:1-8, make it quite plain that any fool can obtain eternal redemption *by asking for it.* He doesn't have to go to a crane-operator or a door-keeper or a secretary to get any "operation" going.

2. Christ "left a priesthood, that *His own priesthood* would not be *extinguished"* (Trent). Again, the peculiar perverseness of the Council makes it condemn the Bible. Christ is said to be an eternal Priest, "Who ever lives to make intercession" (Heb 7:25-27). He did not have to worry about any irreligious claptrap. The overweight, beer-headed plenipotentiaries at the Council had the monstrous conceit to suppose that Christ's priesthood would be extinguished if *they* had not "continued." (Hebrews 10:1-7 is a lucid comment on this kind of self-deception.)

3. Christ left to His church a *"visible sacrifice"* (Trent). But both the Council and the Knights have said that the blood and the body are *not visible, but only visible under the "species of bread and wine," AND THE WINE IS NOT THE BLOOD!* Note, that it is "unbloody"

in the Catholic definition, and yet it is said to be the same as the sacrifice of the cross! If it is not the same, then it is not the same. If one is bloody and the other is not, then one is not the same as the other. That isn't all. If the only difference is that one is bloody and the other is not, then how is it that John 6:51-56 is taught in the Catechism as *real flesh and blood?* If it is *not* real, then there is no "transubstantiation" taking place. It is bread and liquor when the priest starts, and it is bread and liquor when he finishes. *A visible sacrifice* implies *a visible sacrifice*, not an invisible sacrifice *"under the appearance of* visible bread and liquor." This is one of the foundation facts of *sanity*. If the bread and wine are visible, and are sacrificed, then the *visible* sacrifice is a sacrifice of *bread and wine*, which are visible. (In teaching John 6:51-56, the priest is always careful to avoid verses 57 and 63, which are in the context. Verse 57 makes it plain that *spiritual* feeding is intended – *not visible;* and verse 63 drives it home by denying that visible *flesh and blood* profit a man anything.)

4. Christ left to His church a visible *"sacrifice."* But alas! The Lord's Supper is *never spoken of as a "sacrifice"* after the resurrection. It has clearly been defined as the *"communion* of the members of Christ's risen body," and a *"memorial"* to show His death till He come (1Cor 11). The word *"sacrifice,"* when applied to the Lord's Supper, is like applying the word *"holy"* to a St. Christopher statue. *Neither are Christian, nor intelligent.* The Lord's Supper after the resurrection is not a "mass"; and if it is, it is a "mess," for *there is no blood present, by confession of the Catholic Church herself.* ("The same Christ is contained and immolated *in an unbloody manner . . .* " Council of Trent, September 17, 1562.)

5. Christ is said to be "in the mass," under the appearance of bread *and wine.* Yet nowhere does Christ call it "wine," and as though dead-set on making idiots out of popish persons, He deliberately calls what He is squeezing in His hands, *"the fruit of the vine."* If that were

not enough, He calls it *"new* wine," which is interpreted by the Holy Ghost as being *"in the vine,"* not in the jug! (Matt 26:29; Isa 65:8). This brings up an interesting problem. Since all priests and popes use scripture to justify the drinking of fermented liquor, how is it, do you suppose, that none of them from Augustine to Spellman could *read a Bible??* Every Greek manuscript in existence says *"fruit of the vine,"* and *"new";* and every Hebrew manuscript of Isaiah 65:8 says that *"new* wine" is found "in the cluster," not in the bottle! In Genesis 40, the butler squeezed the grapes into a *cup,* exactly as in Matthew 26; and to make sure that this is God's interpretation (and not merely Protestant), Jesus calls it *"the fruit of the vine" – not wine!* Yet all the Knights and the entire "Holy Mother Church" refer to it as *"wine."* Why? Can't they read? Why argue about "interpretations," when you are not yet able to read one-syllable words? "Wine," "vine," "fruit," "cup," "new." *What is so difficult?* Nothing is difficult. Rome has only followed her age-long practice of going the long way around, so that the dust cloud raised will *hide* the truth! The scriptures clearly interpret Rome's teaching for what it is – fascist smog.

6. To be saved, a man must appropriate Christ's sacrifice *as it is represented and reproduced, "bloodlessly," by a Vatican priest.* (See Knights, above.) The statement needs no comment. If it were appropriated, it could not save a dead horse, *for it is bloodless.* "We have peace through His blood," and are "saved by His blood," and "justified by His blood" (Rom 5; Col 2; Eph 1), and we don't need a little black-robed spook, reproducing something, without blood, to get us to God. We have already received by faith an eternal, sinless, *bloody,* effectual, never-to-be-repeated, *perfect atonement and sacrifice,* without Rome's intervention.

Let the reader be cautioned against assuming that any straw dummies have been erected, or that Rome has been "misrepresented" or "distorted from context," or "quoted piecemeal." People who think this *do not check Roman*

Doctrine. Anyone can find out exactly what a priest believes by picking up a fist-full of Knights of Columbus literature; and make no mistake about it, they believe that the Roman Catholic Mass is essential to the salvation of every Christian, and that no Christian can gain Heaven by faith in the Atonement, without the intercessory work and ministry of the Roman Catholic bachelor's "Mass." The Catholic says, "Of course I have received Christ – I receive Him every Sunday."

Question: "If you receive Him every Sunday, under the appearance of bread and wine (and it is not "wine" in scripture!), then you digest Him – *and then what happens to Him between the time you take Him and the time you show up at mass again?*" Don't duck it. If the victim is "present" under the "appearances" (and Rome says that He is), and then you eat *it (Him?)* or *Him (it?),* then what happens to Him *(it?)* or to it *(Him?)* later? The bone is here cut to the marrow. The Catholic – as his Buddhist, Confucian, Taoist, Mohammedan, Protestant, Jewish, Communist, Atheist, Rosicrucian, Bahaist, Zen, Mystic, Spiritualist, and Voodoo brethern – is confounding worshipping a *thing* for a *person;* an *"it"* for a living Lord. This is why Paul cautioned against wasting time with the *teachings* (things) of Jesus to Israel, in His earthly ministry, and told us rather to be occupied with the *Heavenly Lord Himself,* now risen and ministering to the Gentiles, and who is to return. Catholicism, when reduced to its simplest essentials (in regard to the fifth private interpretation), is simply this:

1. "We claim authority to interpret the scriptures."

2. "We therefore interpret them as giving us the right to interpret anything – even if it *crosses* the rest of scripture."

3. "We interpret the Lord's Supper, before the Crucifixion, as being one and the same with *the bloody sacrifice* of Calvary, before the Resurrection, and the Communion *after* the Resurrection."

4. "To maintain this nonsense, we reserve for our-

selves the right to change the meaning of English words, so that even though they are *the same*, one is *bloody* and the other two are not! Still they are the same, because when we got the authority to *interpret*, we got the authority to make things the *same*, even when they are *not the same!*"

5. "Since Paul said the *body* was made of believers, we say it is the corpse of Christ before He had a living body, after the Resurrection. Since the Bible says *'fruit of the vine,'* we say *'wine'*; and since the Bible says the supper is a *'memorial,'* we say that it is a *'sacrifice.'* Thus we prove that we are the only infallible and authoritative 'pillar and ground of truth.' "

The only thing wrong is that Rome has privately interpreted the passage to the place where it is in the category of an atomic fission in the middle of a religious orgy. The scriptures were not consulted in the interpretation. The scriptures *deny* the interpretation, and outrightly *defy* the self-appointed authority of the Roman Church. Where the papist is maddeningly obscure, rebelliously defiant, purposely complicated, outrageously abstract, designedly baffling, and deliberately *anti-Biblical* – the Bible, itself, is short, clear, concise, true, and stands till heaven and earth pass away, as a witness to *the one, effectual, bloody sacrifice* of a sinless man, Who is "able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by Him" (Heb 7:25). Let *the heathen* go get their neuter god by a "priest"!

THE SIXTH PRIVATE INTERPRETATION

The sixth private interpretation of the great perverter of the Word of God is derived from the following passage:

"Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3:5).

Remembering, of course, that the papist has already privately interpreted the "kingdom of God" to be the Roman Catholic Church (although Romans 14:17 has deliberately defined it as something else), the passage in John 3 offers a remarkable opportunity for contorted exegesis.

Again, let us search the scriptures for the comparative passages, before plunging into the Stygian abyss of Roman confusion.

" . . . Except a man be born OF WATER . . . " (John 3:5).

"And God said, LET THE WATERS BRING FORTH ABUNDANTLY the moving creature that hath life . . . " (Gen 1:20).

"DRINK WATERS OUT OF THINE OWN CISTERN . . . Let thy fountains be dispersed abroad . . . Let thy fountain be blessed: and rejoice WITH THE WIFE OF THY YOUTH" (Prov 5:15,16,18).

"Hear ye this, O house of Jacob, which are called by the name of Israel, and are come forth OUT OF THE WATERS of Judah . . . " (Isa 48:1).

It is apparent from the passages that all of the Old Testament writers recognized a *water* birth as the first birth. Scientists may not have used this term until the seventeenth or eighteenth century, but science's ignorance is no shame to the Bible. The first thing that brings forth life is *water;* a man's wife is the fountain from which the *water* brings his progeny; and a man's heritage in the past is a river of *water* from which he comes. And if this were not enough, right in the context where Jesus is speaking, the man he is talking to has just asked, "How can a man be

born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be *born?"* (John 3:4).

No matter how many cross-references are made to Ezekiel 36, where commentators suppose Jesus to be referring to the restoration of Israel, or how many references run to Ephesians 5 in an effort to spiritualize the water to mean "the word," the cold, hard fact remains that the context is *natural birth.* That is not all. The change from John 3:3 to John 3:5 is meaningless unless it has reference to the verse in-between. Why would Jesus change "a man must be born again," to "born of water and of the Spirit," when all that took place in the interval was a man asking how he can "enter into his mother's womb and be born"? A text without a context is a pretext. No matter what is done with the text, where it stands it refers to *two births.* Notice that immediately following the "water and spirit" statement, the clincher comes – "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again" (John 3:6,7).

What could be clearer! How far this is from the Council of Trent's garrulous and twisted sentences, running twenty lines apiece with subordinate clauses numbering into the dozens, as the Council seeks to *hide* the line of reasoning behind private interpretation.

1. Man is born once of water in the flesh.

2. He needs to be born *again,* of the Spirit, from above.

3. Born once, die twice; born twice, die once (Rev 20:14).

How simple the Bible is, compared with the teachings of the "Holy Mother Church"!!

Now watch the Knights (speaking for their hierarchy), as they butcher the text, add words not found in it, misapply it, and then force it on people who could have found Christ without it!

"Baptism puts us *in union with Christ,* causes us to share His life, to the extent that His death is our own and

His resurrection ours. We are dead to sin, alive to the new life of God. *We are new persons.* It is no wonder that St. Peter says simply, *'Baptism . . . saves you'* (1Pet 3:21). *This does not mean, of course, that baptism is an automatic guarantee of salvation. There is no such thing as an absolute, infallible certainty of salvation during this life (!), because at any time man has it in his power to turn his back on God and reject Him"* (!!) (p. 13, "This is the Catholic Church," Knights of Columbus).

"Baptism, a sign of membership in Christ's Church, is more than a sign – *it is an absolute necessity.* 'Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God,' were Christ's words to Nicodemus" (John 3:5). (The Knight then quotes Romans 6:3-11 as proof that *water* baptism puts a man spiritually into Jesus Christ, without the Holy Spirit baptism of 1Corinthians 12:13, and that water baptism *crucifies a man with Christ!)*

Southerners are rather amused to find the old teaching of Alexander Campbell so deftly put forth by the Catholic Church. Since all Bible-believing Christians have had some experience in dealing with this ancient heresy that originated in the second and third centuries among some of the "Church Fathers," it is highly improbable that any of them could take it seriously. However, it does have a tremendous effect on the heathen population (composed of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews) of any nation. It has such effect, that people actually think that there is something *magical* about water baptism. This is why it is called (as the Mass) a *sacrament* – something "sacred." Where Paul calls these things "ordinances," the papist calls them "sacraments" – more private interpretation.

According to Rome, the teaching is:

1. Water baptism is essential to salvation.

2. But people who have been baptized *have not been saved.*

(This is one of the Campbellite "funnyisms." The man has to be baptized to be saved, but if he "loses it," he

does *not* have to be baptized again to be saved again! To explain this highly amusing fantasy, several volumes of "explanations" of Augustine's theory of "original sin" have been written, none of which do any better than to confuse the issue further.)

"Baptism saves you . . . " say the Knights. But alas! Peter said nothing of the kind. The passage quoted, which the Knight dissected as neatly as any Campbellite ever dissected Mark 16:16, reads as follows:

"The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, *but the answer of a good conscience toward God),* by the resurrection of Jesus Christ" (1Pet 3:21).

Like a boy caught in the pantry, the old "Mother Church" is caught with her slip showing. She has purposely and intentionally *split* the Word of God in two, subtracted from the God-breathed words of authority, and *mutilated* the Greek text, for subjective and personal reasons of private interpretation. St. Peter did *not* say "simply" that "baptism doth save us." He said nothing of the kind in any Bible in print, and no one but a *spiritual pervert* would "quote" him as saying something that he did *not* say, unless their motive was to prove that *their* baptism *saves people from Hell!* You may rest assured that the Knights of Columbus are no more fit to comment on the Holy Scriptures than a two-week-old Ubangi. St. Peter did *not* say what they said he said, and he never will. The quotation is *half-given,* for the purpose of leaving an impression not to be found if the *whole quotation* were given. Baptism does *not* save, and there is not one verse in the New Testament that says it does.

Freshman students of the English Bible readily spot the trouble with the Roman private interpretation of John 3:5. It is simply reading the word "baptism" into the text, where no "baptism" is found. This is called in abnormal psychiatry, a *"mental block,"* or *"fixation";* and it consists of reading *"water"* everytime you see the word "baptism," and reading *"baptism"* everytime you see the word

"water." Since the scriptures list *seven* baptisms (and *three* of them are said *not* to be "water"), it is most certain that the reading of *"water"* everytime the word *"baptism"* occurs, is adding to the scriptures what God has forbidden to be added. The three baptisms that are in no way connected with *water* are:

1. Baptism in a cloud (1Cor 10:1-4).
2. Baptism by fire (Matt 3:11).
3. Baptism with the Holy Ghost (1Cor 12:13).

The Catholic gets confused exactly where the Campbellite gets confused. He reads of *"one baptism"* in Ephesians 4 (the basis on which the present Pope is trying to re-claim all baptized Protestants), and surmises that this just *has* to be *Roman Catholic "water" baptism.* Such a surmising is in the first place ignorant, and in the second place conceited, and in the third place non-Biblical, and in the fourth place *useless.* The only one true baptism which puts a man *into* Jesus Christ (Gal 3:27) is said to be made "without hands," through the "operation of God" (Col 2:11,12); and if it is not done by the Holy Spirit, Himself (1Cor 12:13), the subject of baptism *is not "in Christ," and is lost* (2Cor 5:17; Rom 8:9). Since the implications of these passages are so viciously anti-Catholic, it is not to be expected that the papist will ever recognize any valid baptism by the Lord, but only *water* baptism by the Roman Church. "Saving baptism" is defined in the scriptures by the Holy Spirit, Himself (the author of scripture), as *Spirit baptism into Christ's body.* Rome's definition of "saving baptism," then, is private, irrelevant, unrelated to truth, divorced from context, and misapplied to its subjects.

In Acts 2:38, water baptism is connected with Israel's salvation, and all of them receive the Holy Ghost *when* baptized into water. In John 20, the disciples receive the Holy Ghost *after* they have been saved, and none are baptized according to Acts 2:38. In Acts 8, they receive the Holy Ghost by laying-on-of-hands, *after* they have been baptized. In Acts 10, they receive the Holy Ghost by

faith, *before* they are baptized. And in Acts 17, those who are saved are not baptized at all in water!

But how could a Pope, with his superstitious ignorance of the New Testament, ever hope to begin to unravel the book of Acts? All he can do is force Roman private interpretation on the Bible and wrest the scriptures from their context to prove his own stupid interpretation is "of the Holy Ghost."

There is not a case on record in either Testament where water baptism ever put anyone "into Christ," gave them a "new birth," saved their soul, or gave them any grace to do anything. Every verse quoted by Rome (or by Campbell) inserts the word *"water"* into the verse where no water is found. If you think I am lying, buy a Bible and read it (Mark 16:16; Matt 28:19; Acts 2:38; Acts 22:16,17; 1Pet 3:2l; Rom 6:1-5; Gal 3:27; Eph 4:1-4). Only in Acts 2:38 and Acts 22:16-17 (where all subjects are Old Testament Jews and Jewish proselytes), is water even *associated* with spiritual condition. To apply these verses to Gentiles in the church-age, is to confess ignorance, perversity, willful rejection of the Word, and insincerity in Bible study.

Rome's rebuttal is as stupid as it is unholy:

"One may wonder how it is that a little water, either poured or sprinkled, can produce such a tremendous effect on the soul. The reason is that when the application of the water is accompanied by the words prescribed by our Lord, He . . . imparts a mysterious efficacy to the water which it does not by itself possess" (!!) (p. 42, "Does the Bible Contradict Itself?", Knights of Columbus).

Chapter and verse?

Where is this mysterious, magical water?

Chapter and verse?

"Thus do all Catholics believe and all are baptized. All are, therefore, "BORN-AGAIN CHRISTIANS" (!) (p. 42, Ibid.).

But our sense of humour can only take so much! If all Catholics are born-again by *sprinkling,* and can lose

their new birth by departing from God, but *do not need* to get sprinkled again to get salvation back – and at the same time depend on sprinkling *for immersion* ("to baptize" means "to dip," or "to immerse") – *what on earth is anyone talking about?*

Long ago the plain, simple truth of scripture-with-scripture has left the scene, and we are merely reading the superficial ravings of a demented philosopher who cannot match words.

There is no *water* in John 3:5, and there is no *new birth* in 1Peter 3:21. How can they be added when they are not there, never have been there, never will be there, and are forbidden to be there? Since when did Rome get the authority to not only add *books* to the Bible that are not there, but also to add *words to the verses, that are not there?*

Private interpretations are found in Roman theology, not only in the departments of what constitutes "the church" and which church has the authority to change the Bible, but also in the very doctrines of salvation, thereby preventing the sinner from being born again. In the Bible, baptism is not a "sacrament," but an "ordinance"; it is not "salvation," but a "figure" of salvation; it puts no one "into Christ," but represents the believer's previous identification with Christ; it is by "immersion," not by "sprinkling"; in every case after Acts 2 it follows salvation, and in Acts 2 only those who *believed* were baptized; it is one of seven forms, three of which are not water; and in the Bible water baptism is never connected, directly or indirectly, with any Catholic on the face of the earth. *The word "catholic" is not a Bible word.*

THE SEVENTH PRIVATE INTERPRETATION

Coming to the seventh private interpretation, we find a passage in 1Corinthians 3 so mangled and garbled from its plain wording that it is an eighth wonder of the world how anyone could honestly believe the Catholic teaching.

"If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire" (1Cor 3:14,15).

Comparing scripture with scripture, so as to avoid the pit-falls of Roman interpretation, we find:

"Every man's WORK shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare IT, because IT shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's WORK OF WHAT SORT IT IS" (context of the passage in 1Cor 3 – verse 13).

" . . . For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ" (Rom 14:10).

"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive THE THINGS done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether IT be good or bad" (2Cor 5:10).

"Everything that may abide the fire, ye shall make IT go through the fire, and IT shall be clean . . . and all that abideth not the fire ye shall make go through the water" (Num 31:23).

It does not take a Ph.D. in Greek grammar to see that what is being tested by the fire are *things* – not people. In every case it is called "things," "works," or "it"; and in no case is it ever called *people,* in any language, in any Bible, anywhere in the world. The notion that fire can cleanse *people,* or *people's sins,* is not found anywhere in the New Testament. (Once in Isaiah 6, a live coal off the altar under the throne of God cleanses a prophet's iniquity, as he is representative of Israel; but nowhere does *fire* cleanse anyone from sin, or cleanse anyone spiritually.) We are told *three* times that *purging* ("purge," "purgatory") is *by blood* – not by fire! (Heb 1:3; 9:22; 9:14). Again, the

Holy Spirit interprets His own work *contrary* to Roman Catholic private interpretation.

"Purgatory" may be Roman, and a hand-made middle hell for Romans who reject what God has said, in hopes that their church has rightly *interpreted* the Bible; but "Bible" it is not – it is no more "Bible" or "Christian" than Limbo, Bridey Murphy, the Happy Hunting Grounds, or Valhalla.

The Council of Trent places all under a curse who refuse to believe this doctrine of "purgatory." The statement is written as follows in Canon XXX, at the Sixth Session of the Council, January 13, 1547:

"If anyone saith, that, after the grace of justification has been received . . . and the debt of eternal punishment is blotted out in such wise that there remains not any debt . . . to be discharged either in this world, or in the next in purgatory, before the entrance to the kingdom of heaven (!) can be opened to him, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA."

This places Dwight Moody, Billy Graham, Paul, Peter, James, John, Chrysostom, Billy Sunday, Bob Jones, Frank Norris, and Charles Fuller under a curse (anathema). *None of them believed it!* Note how blatantly and indiscriminately the "Holy Mother Church" throws curses around – as though she, herself, had the power to curse anyone! The only power Rome ever had was *political;* and that is the only power she has today. Without guns, knives, decrees, court orders, policemen, courts, lawyers, law-suits, lobbyists, subpoenas, summons, and armies, *she has no power.* She couldn't curse a June bug.

1. In the decree, the word "purgatory" is inserted, even though there is no such word in scripture, or anything like it.

2. The term "kingdom of heaven" has been privately interpreted to mean *"heaven,"* which it does not mean anywhere in the New Testament.

3. The debt of eternal punishment is *not blotted out* in the Roman definition, for much of it remains to be

paid. Everywhere, the New Testament wipes out the debt completely. (See Heb 10:1-14; Col 1,2; Rom 5:1-10; etc.)

Appeal is made by the papists to Matthew, where we find given a pre-crucifixion Jewish parable to disciples under the Law. However, even the stupidest of readers can see that there is no "purgatory" in the passage. The setting is temporal – not eternal; the tormentors are people – not fire; the man was *completely* forgiven for *everything*, before he suffered; the forgiveness is conditional on works; and there is no blood-atonement present, no forgiveness on the grounds of the finished work of Christ, and no new-birth in the man being used as an illustration. Rome goes stumbling and slipping around in the scripture like a three-year-old in a grease pit, not knowing what goes where, what fits where, how to get in or out, and how to stand up without falling flat. Every appeal to scripture to prove that the Christian must *pay for his sins, himself*, is placed on a scripture that does not deal with the Christian. The born-again, blood-bought believer has had so much experience with apostates in Protestantism who follow this line of reasoning and these particular scriptures, that there is little need to go over them in detail.

The list of verses most commonly appealed to, and cited throughout the Knights of Columbus literature, over and over again, is as follows (and I have listed beside the verse the Knights' book which uses it as a proof text):

1. 2Timothy 1:18 is applied to the "church" now in purgatory. Onesiphorus didn't quite make it, and Paul is commending him – in purgatory – to God for mercy! ("Do You Understand What God Told Us?" (!), p.31).

2. Matthew 19:18 is used to prove that you have to keep the Old Testament commandments to get to Heaven (Ibid., p. 22).

3. James 2:17 is quoted for the same purpose as above (Ibid., p. 22).

4. Ephesians 4:15, "This is the means of sharing in the Redemption of Christ" (Ibid., p. 22).

5. Philippians 2:12 is used to prove that you will go

to hell if you don't *work* at salvation (Ibid., p. 21).

6. Matthew 7:21 is applied to born-again Christians (Ibid., p. 21).

7. Matthew 25:31-46 is said to teach that forgiveness at the Last Judgment is determined by "help to your neighbor"! (Ibid., p. 21).

8. Luke 1:28 is used to prove that since petition follows prayer, the Christian should pray, *"Holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us sinners, now and at the hour of our death. Amen."* (!)

9. 2Corinthians 5:10 and Romans 14:12 are applied to the last Judgment of Revelation 20, instead of to the Judgment Seat of Christ ("What Happens After Death?", p. 24).

10. Matthew 13:33 is applied to the Body of Christ, instead of to the Harlot Church of Revelation 17 ("What Do You Mean Only One True Church?", p. 33).

11. Colossians 1:24,25 are used to prove that Christ's sufferings have to be applied to a sinner *by the Roman Catholic Church* (Ibid,. p. 21).

In addition to the verses listed, the standard verses are used, which all agnostics use who are trying to merit eternal life by self-righteousness. These are 2Peter 2,3, Hebrews 3,6,10, John 15, Revelation 3, 1Corinthians 9, and 10. The passages are too well known to the Bible-believer to warrant going into detail here. Commenting briefly on this *evidence* – which is produced to "prove" that the believer has to earn Heaven by works (contrary to Rom 4,5,6,7,8,9,10); and therefore, if he fails, must spend a convalescent period in "purgatory" – it may be said:

1. 2Timothy 1:18 refers to the *"day of Christ"* in its context, as it does everywhere in the New Testament; and where the "day of God" is mentioned, it always refers, without exception, to the Last Judgment. (Study 2Pet 3; Rev 20; 2Thes 2; and 2Tim 4.) The private interpreting of *"that day"* as meaning a fictitious period of time in purgatory, is trivial jesting and foolish trifling with interpretation, and is unworthy of a beatnik.

2. Matthew 19:18 is given to Jewish disciples before the Cross. The Sabbath is omitted in the commandments. The Lord is speaking in a dispensation that still included works for salvation (see Rom 10:1-8), and to pull this verse forward and put it directly over the shed blood of Christ on the cross, and then force it on a believer who has been set free by this blood, is a religious black-mail and embezzlement. A text without a context is a pretext.

3. James 2:17 refers to Abraham in the Old Testament, before the shed blood. The epistle itself is addressed to "the twelve tribes" – not to the church (James 1:1); and the passage concerns the evidence of saving faith – not the *means of obtaining heaven.* More private interpretation of a crass and base nature!

4. Ephesians 4:15 is referring to the Christian's growth *in Christ* after his redemption, and is no more connected with *sharing in redemption* than a plant growing in a hot-house is "sharing" in regulating the temperature of the sun. Read the passage; don't be a prig all your life.

5. Philippians 2:12 shows a violent mishandling of context, since the "working out of the salvation" is never connected with anything in the future. The very next verse says: "For it is God which worketh in you . . . " God is doing the works that are connected with your salvation; and since you are told to work it *"out"* – not *"in"* – then you already have it, and are not working *to get it!* You cannot "work *out"* something you don't have! The Bible says *"work out"* – not *"work at."* But then, who has the power to enable a papist to read one-syllable words correctly?

6. Matthew 7:21-23. In its vicious hatred for the born-again believer, the Knights of Columbus have here jammed a verse down his throat that is not even associated with Christian experience. Notice that the verses say to those addressed, "Depart from me . . . I never knew you." Since when can our Great Shepherd say to one of his sheep, *"I never knew you," when He does know them and they know Him, and they are in Him and He is in them?*

(John 10:1-26; 1Cor 12). If He *ever* knew you, He would have to lie to say *"I never knew you."* Would our Lord lie like a Pope?

7. Matthew 25:31-46. In this great passage on the Judgment of the Nations at the second advent, the poor stupid Catholic has the sheep, goats, and brethren all mixed up. Not being able to read a Bible, the priests and archbishops and bishops have failed to notice that in Matthew 25 there is no book of life, no dead raised, no last judgment, no judgment in Heaven, no Great White Throne, and no one present but *nations.* In Revelation 20, all the conflicting elements will be found, listed so plainly that no "interpretation" is needed. Revelation 20 takes place *in Heaven,* with books open; the criterion of judgment is "names in the book of life"; there are no sheep or goats; there, the Son of man is not on "the throne of his glory" (as in Matt 25); and there is no "inheriting the kingdom" at the end of Revelation 20, for the "inheritance" took place on earth a thousand years before the Last Judgment showed up! (see Rev 20:4). (The "Holy, Infallible Mother Church" is obviously a dunce when it comes to correct reading of sixth-grade English!)

8. Luke 1:28. The "Hail Mary" is addressed to a woman who needs to be purified for her sins (Luke 2:22-24) according to the "Law of the Lord," and who, unlike her heathen devotees, recognizes the fact that she needs a Saviour, just like any other sinner needs One (see Luke 1:47). The only thing she ever told any Catholic to do was to "do whatsoever Christ says to do" (John 2:1-6). And since there is *"one mediator* between God and men, the *man* Christ Jesus" (1Tim 2:5), Mary is content to take her place with normal people who need a mediator.

9. 2Cor 5:10 and Rom 14:12 *are both said, right in their contexts, to refer to the "Judgment Seat of Christ"* – not to the last judgment of the Great White Throne, or to the Judgment of the Nations before the "throne of his glory" (Matt 25). *How, then, are they the same?* Who "interpreted" this mess?

10. Matthew 13:33 comments on a church that puts out stinking, stale *malt* (leaven) – not the truth; and she corrupts three measures of meal, without spreading any truth anywhere, for *leaven* always stands for false doctrine, according to the infallible, authoritative interpretation of the Holy Ghost, Himself. (See His interpretation given in Matt 16:11,12; Gal 5:9).

11. Colossians 1:24,25 is a statement on Paul's ministry in fulfillment of Acts 9:16; and to read "Roman" into it, or "Church," or "Roman Church," or "Catholic Church," is the same sort of trick as reading "baptism" into the *"water"* of John 3:5. Same stunt. You just add something that is not there, and then "interpret" without any regard for the context or for the comparative passages of scripture.

2Peter 2 deals with false prophets and teachers (2Pet 2:1), and no where is a Christian "sheep" found among the "pigs" and "dogs" of 2Peter 2:20-22. Hebrews 6:1-6 is addressed to people who cannot get saved if they do lose it, and the Christians are found in verse 9, in contrast to them. Hebrews 10:26-31 is addressed to "my people," (quoting from Deut 32), and therefore is aimed at the same ones the entire epistle is aimed at – *Hebrews*, and not "Christians." John 15:1-8 does not say, "If any *abiding branch* does not bear fruit it is cast into the fire," but "If *any man* abide not, he is cast forth *as* a branch." 2Peter 3 speaks about falling from steadfastness *in doctrine* – not falling out of the body of the Lord Jesus into hell. Revelation 3 is a promise that He *will not blot you out* – not a threat that He will (see 1John 4:4; 5:4). 1Corinthians 9 is "falling" in the sense of falling into sin and being killed physically (note context); and the "cast-away" of 1Corinthians 9 is not in a context of losing salvation, but of being "cast-away" from the ministry, which is the discussion of the entire chapter. And to top it all off, Hebrews 3:6 is the discussion of *a house and household* – not a body of born-again believers! And so it goes. The Catholic answer to this is, "Oh, that's just your

interpretation." But since the "interpretation is taken from comparative passages, in their context, without addition or subtraction of words, in the conviction that the Bible is holy and infallible, then it is certain that the "interpretation" *is God's, and not Rome's!* Rome's "interpretations" thus far have proved to be nothing but philosophical speculations, built on a biased ignorance of truth and a bigoted pride in an ecclesiastical morgue.

"The Catholic Church believes, ON THE AUTHORITY OF GOD REVEALING, that there is a state after death which is commonly called purgatory . . . we also believe that the prayers of the living, especially those which we offer through Christ IN THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS, can move God to be merciful to people in purgatory" (p. 28, "Let Us Judge Catholics by the Bible," Knights of Columbus).

But look out! While the *"authority of God"* is quoted, the only quotation produced is from the thirteenth chapter of the Apocryphal book of Second Maccabees! The writer who produced this spurious fairy-tale (which was never accepted by any orthodox Jew or Christian in 2300 years), is said to be *"the inspired author"* (Ibid., p. 29). And after quoting a page of "the inspired author," the Knights say, *"It is impossible to understand how the Bible could mention the Catholic belief in purgatory more clearly than this."*

But that is not in the Bible! Second Maccabees is not in the Bible that Christ authorized! (See "The Fourth Private Interpretation." Paul quoted heathen poetry before he would quote Maccabees (see Acts 17 and Titus 1).

Rome has called a man *"inspired,"* who was no more "inspired" than Rin-Tin-Tin. Rome *invented* an "inspired book" and an "inspired author" that no New Testament Christian ever recognized as "inspired."

In vain the Knights quote the "Pastor of Hermas," Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian, Hippolytus, and Origen. But these only *speak of* the book, and never refer to it being "inspired," or "the Word of God," or "the Scrip-

tures." Clement is a philosophical Judaizer, so is Origen; and Cyprian believed in baptismal regeneration, and his "interpretations" were nearly as fouled up as were Constantine's and Augustine's.

To teach *purgatory*, Rome has had to invent an "inspired book." She then cursed everyone who did not believe that the book was inspired, and then cursed again everyone who did not believe in the doctrines found in it. (See decrees of Trent concerning the Canon.)

Out goes private interpretation number six. No prayers for the dead; no masses for the dead; no "devouring widow's houses for long prayers"; and no more asinine stories about "he's almost out – let's pray a little harder!" Purgatory is just like baloney. The same word, spelled two different ways: P-U-R-G-A-T-O-R-Y and B-A-L-O-N-E-Y. Same word. "Inspired" garbage! Born-again, New Testament believers in the Lord Jesus Christ have no more to fear of purgatory than of a blizzard in New Guinea.

THE EIGHTH PRIVATE INTERPRETATION

We come now to the eighth and final private interpretation of that great master of private interpreters, the "Holy Mother Church." This one concerns the means of getting to God. (The reader will observe that already Rome has authorized herself to add to the Word, change the Word, subtract from the Word, control your forgiveness, control your access to the atonement, and control your after-life through "masses" ("messes?"). Now in the final coup de grace, she *inserts* between the lost sinner and Jesus Christ (or between the Christian and his Saviour), a whole list of supernumeraries, until "the way, the truth, and the life" looks like a corporal trying to get a message through the Pentagon to Dean Rusk.

"For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time" (1Tim 2:5,6).

Here – in a Pauline epistle, written by the apostle to the Gentiles (who *did* go to Rome!) – we have one of the plainest, clearest, shortest, most lucid passages anywhere in the Bible on how *all men* get to God. The passage is so plain that it needs no "interpretation" whatsoever. As it stands, it is self-explanatory. Now if any man or woman had any doubt about Roman Catholic intention to *pervert* and *complicate* the Bible, this passage would demonstrate that intention. *One mediator. One God.* "One mediator between God and men." *The mediator is a man.* Fortunately, no one has to "interpret" anything; and the Holy Spirit has deliberately worded the passage so that it could be explained to a seven-year-old in less than twenty seconds. The *one man,* who is this mediator, tells His disciples to pray "in his name" (John 16:24). Nowhere in the history of the Acts does any disciple, under any condition, in any situation, with any purpose, *ever* pray in the name of Mary, Jude, Christopher, Joseph, or "blessed John the Baptist." As if to heap coals of fire upon the liberal, worldly, religious "Cain-systems," that *hate the*

exclusiveness of God in discriminating against them, the Holy Spirit speaks of:

One sacrifice. One way. One truth. One life.

One ransom. One name above all. One offering forever.

One sacrifice once. One Saviour. One mediator. One advocate.

One head of all. One source of all truth. One source of all interpretation. (See Heb 10:1-12; Phil 2; John 14; 1Tim 2; 1John 2:1-3; Eph 1; Col 1).

The only way that the Roman bishops could "muscle-in on the territory" was to claim that the body of Christ, made up of born-again believers baptized by the Spirit, was *the Catholic Church, made up of Vatican-obeying Romans baptized into an organization by sprinkling of water* – and we have adequately covered the private interpretations that led to this ridiculous position.

"There is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

Now watch the Knights of Columbus attack the scriptures!

"Not only do we find the early Christians addressing prayers to God, but to other Christians as well . . . (He then quotes Rom 15:30). *In thus addressing a prayer to his fellow Christians, was he offending God, or robbing Him of any of the honour which is His due? On the contrary, he was following out Christian teaching, " . . . pray one for another . . . "* (James 5:16).

Now go back and study this interpretation. Notice that Rome cannot understand the meanings of the prepositions *"to"* and *"for."* No wonder she is always talking about the need for "an authoritative interpreter"! The Knights have just said that *Paul addressed a prayer "to" a fellow Christian,* and then quoted a passage that says pray *"for" a Christian!* What kind of crooked tomfoolery is *this?*

When you pray *for* a sick man, are you asking him to heal himself? When you pray *for* a new car, are you asking

the car to do something? When you pray *for* help, are you addressing "help" as God Almighty?

What on earth do you suppose would possess any man, for any motive, to confound a prayer *to* God with a prayer *for* God. In James, one man is praying to God *for* another man to get healed. In Romans 15:30, Paul is beseeching, *by a written epistle*, his brothers in Christ; and he is doing it *through the one mediator given* – Jesus Christ!

Note: "Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake . . . " (Rom 15:30).

In Romans 12:1, the word "beseech" is used again; and in every case it is a fervent request made to a man about something Paul wants him to do. How can this be confounded with *going through a mediator to God for something you want?* How on earth is it that at every turn the Roman bishops and popes are utterly unable to join equal things or separate different things? What possesses them that they cannot intelligibly interpret *anything?* (A man might be forgiven for busting his theological neck in Acts 2, Heb 6, Heb 10, or Acts 19; but what in the world can be done with a nut who cannot distinguish between praying *for* someone (on their behalf), and praying *to* someone (as the answerer of the prayer)? My, my. Can't a man learn second-grade prepositions??

Now in this aborted and distorted quotation (taken from page 32 of "Let Us Judge Catholics by the Bible"), the Knights instruct the "Christian" (?) to insert the name of *"Mary"* for the word "brethren" in Romans 15:30 – thus getting a request to a living person in writing, transferred to a *prayer to a dead person, in true prayer.* Thus, *"We beseech you, Mary, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the charity of the Holy Spirit . . . "* The Knights say, *"If you substitute the name of Mary, or any saint, in the place of "my brethern" in St. Paul's prayer, you have identically the same prayer which the Catholic Church offers to Mary and the saints."*

But since when did God authorize a black-robed hood

to *substitute* words in place of the words given by the Holy Ghost? Since when did the Bible give authority to anyone to correct its authority? *"If you substitute . . . "* But, my dear friend, you are *not* to substitute – not even when you desire to manufacture or invent a multiplicity of mediators in order to confuse and contradict 1Timothy 2:5. You are not to substitute to obtain a private interpretation. You are to read and believe to obtain God's interpretation. If Rome had to *substitute* (and she admits that she did and does!), then her "interpretation," again, is completely divorced from New Testament truth. If you have to change the New Testament (and they admit "substitution") to obtain your interpretation, then it follows as waves follow the shore that your interpretation *is not that of the author of the New Testament. It is private interpretation.*

Now study this example, which shows the lengths to which a papist will go to overthrow the clear teaching of scripture. A verse has been picked out where a *living saint is besought to do something, by letter,* which Paul desires him to do *for Christ.* When the substitution is made (Rome admittedly adding words that are not there), we have a prayer request *not written, made to a dead saint, who is supposed to be answering prayers!*

1. A substitution has been made.
2. It has been made for a purpose.
3. Its purpose is to prove that there is *more than* "one mediator."
4. It has been substituted where a substitution could not be made without distorting the structure, sense, and meaning of the verse in which it has been substituted.
5. The substitution *creates* a doctrine not found anywhere in the New Testament.
6. The substitution, therefore, is *private interpretation;* it is contrary to the Holy Ghost; it is not Christian; it is pagan and heathen; and it is not connected, in any manner, to the New Testament faith. It is purely and simply *Roman substitution for true interpretation.*

Since all heretics question the Word of God (Gen 3:1), and try to cast doubt on the simple passages, it would not be surprising to find the Knights of Columbus writing:

"But what did he mean when he spoke of Jesus Christ as our mediator?" (Answer: "He meant what he said, you sophist!")

"Did he not refer to the fact that Christ alone was the redeemer of mankind . . . . that as a man He died and offered His death as a redemptive sacrifice? Likewise, Christ our redeemer is ever-living to make intercession for us. But we ask, because Jesus Christ as our redeemer is the sole mediator between God and men, does this mean that the terms "mediator" and "intercessor" cannot be used in other sense and applied to others for different reasons?" (Answer: "Yes, as long as the *reason* is not connected with getting anyone in contact with God, for the verse says "One mediator between God and men.")

"Many do not seem to realize that Paul spoke of Jesus Christ as the one mediator between God and men, and this does not exclude the possibility (!) or even hint (!) at the incongruity of there being intermediaries between Jesus Christ and other men. Indeed, the whole Bible takes such mediation for granted."

Does it really? Then if it takes it for granted, surely the poor, deluded, muddled, confused, complicated, and garbled Roman interpreters can produce some scripture to show that this is the case. Yes, here it is on pages 34-35.

1. Mary was the *medium* through which Christ came.
2. This makes her a *mediatrix*, as well as a "medium."
3. John the Baptist was a *mediator* in John 1:29.
4. Andrew *mediated* in John 1:40-42.
5. Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were *mediums* for writing.
6. A man who baptizes is a *mediator* between men and Christ.

7. 1Timothy 4:16 is quoted as proof that a *mediator can save both himself and those that hear him from Hell.* (!)
8. Mary was a *mediatrix* in John 2, who served to get the wine ready.

This is the Knights of Columbus proof that *"the Bible takes such mediation for granted."*

Now instead of believing everything that you read, look up the passages cited, and notice that in every case the context is in connection with Christ's earthly ministry, before the resurrection and the Coming of the Holy Ghost into the believer. In the case of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, they do no *medium* work whatsoever – they write as they are moved by the Holy Ghost, doing what the *one mediator* told them to do! In the case of the baptizer, he is not a *mediator* at all, unless you accept the private interpretation of Rome that teaches that *water sprinkling puts a man into Jesus Christ.* A baptizer does a work which God commanded him to do, just as Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John wrote what they were commanded to write.

Where is any *mediating?* There isn't any. So the Pope changes the word to *"medium"* and *"mediatrix"* to get the point across; but is it not amazing how simple the verse was when you started with it – without the Catholic substitutions which complicated it?

"For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1Tim 2:5).

(1Timothy 4:16 is a passage on the Christian ministry, and is not connected in any way with salvation. Since all priests are Bible ignoramuses, it is not surprising that they should think that the word *"save"* would refer to "eternal salvation" every time that it appears. However, right in the same epistle (1Tim), you will find the word used in the context of *"saved" from being deceived,* 1Tim 2:15.) No one is mediating salvation at all. Someone is purposely misreading, misapplying, misappropriating, and misinterpreting the clear passages of the Bible. I wonder who?

"Another Biblical example of mediation is . . . " (and the Knights of Columbus quote the passage in John 2, concerning the wedding in Cana). *"Mary was mediatrix. Our Lord surely sensed the situation, but He waited until it was called to His attention by Mary. Because Mary's prayer was so effective in this case, and induced her son to anticipate the time when He planned to perform His first miracle, many believe in the power of her prayers"* (Ibid., p. 36).

The exposition is now as fouled-up as a Chinese fire-drill. If anyone takes the trouble to read John 2:1-5 (and what Catholic ever checked anything in the scriptures!), he will find that:

1. No one is praying.
2. No prayer is answered.
3. The one asking is ignored.
4. The one asked has not yet died, risen, and sent the Holy Ghost, *who prays and intercedes for us "with groanings that cannot be uttered"* (Rom 8:25-27).

In John 2 Jesus has not yet died; He has given no revelation yet about asking in His name; He rebukes Mary when she requests wine; He addresses her as "woman," and not as "mother"; Mary prays nothing, but makes a flat statement that "they have no wine"; and the One of whom she makes the request has not yet risen to intercede for anyone; and there are *no Christians present* – all are Sabbath-observing, temple-worshipping, pork-abstaining, circumcised, Old Testament Jews!

In short, the text has been taken from the context, the context from the ministry of Christ, the ministry from the gospels, the words from their meaning, the request from the normal interpretation, and the words *"mediatrix"* and *"prayer"* have been inserted, where neither appear or are implied. You could not go further astray in interpretation if you went to a ouija board for the answer.

"And when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus saith unto Him, They have no wine. Jesus saith unto her,

Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come" (John 2:3,4).

Who has prayed anything? Who has asked anything in the name of Christ? Who is *mediating* now that Christ has risen from the dead – when Mary makes a remark about a meal, in the first year of Christ's earthly ministry, to Israel? Are we supposed to be as stupid as a Catholic priest? What kind of numbskull does a Knight think a Bible-believer is, to quote John 2:3, 4, as an example of "*More than one mediator between God and men,*" *or* more than one between Christ and His born-again child? After all, some of us can read – even if Pope Paul can't!

The eighth and final private interpretation is so openly absurd that it defies comment. It seems to sum up the entire history of Roman theology for what it is – one mongrel mess of butchered transpositions, emendations, interpolations, and traditions.

Count up the score and look at it.

The Bible: The church is Christ's body; His body is the church.

Roman Private Interpretation: The church is the Roman Catholic Organization.

The Bible: You enter it by a new birth by the Holy Spirit; you are baptized into it by His Spirit.

Roman Private Interpretation: You enter it by the sprinkling of water by a "priest."

The Bible: You come to God through Christ.

Roman Private Interpretation: You come to God through a dozen intermediates.

The Bible: You commemorate Christ's death with the Supper.

Roman Private Interpretation: The Lord's Supper is an *unbloody sacrifice.*

The Bible: The Bible is the final authority; it is absolute and infallible.

Roman Private Interpretation: Rome is the final authority.

The Bible: It is self-interpreting; and it contradicts

every major Roman Catholic private interpretation.

Roman Private Interpretation: Rome sits in judgment on the scripture wherever it contradicts their own teaching.

The Bible: It presents one Saviour, who is the only mediator between God and men.

Roman Private Interpretation: The sacraments are of equal value in saving, and there are half a dozen "mediums."

The Bible: This Saviour is "able to save to the uttermost" any and all that come to God *by Him.*

Roman Private Interpretation: Christ can save no one till they are dead.

The Bible: He made *one* perfect sacrifice forever, never to be repeated or continued – only to be *commemorated.*

Roman Private Interpretation: His sacrifice has to be continued and applied by a papist to be effective.

The Bible: The symbols of this commemoration are said to be *"His body,"* defined as the present, living body of born-again believers.

Roman Private Interpretation: The symbols are turned by magic formula into real *body,* yet not real *blood.* The body is the *crucified corpse of the dead Jew who died in 33 A.D.*

The Bible: This body is *never* His past earthly corpse. This communion is never connected with salvation after the resurrection.

Roman Private Interpretation: Protestants who do not believe this are *anathema* (cursed).

The Bible: The Bible contains sixty-six books.

Roman Private Interpretation: The Bible contains seventy-three books. Anyone who does not believe this is *anathema* (cursed).

The Bible: Anyone who adds to it is a crooked liar. God will curse anyone who does.

Roman Private Interpretation: The Catholic Church reserves the right to curse anyone who does not agree with

its own decrees and private interpretation.

You do not have to take catechism in a convert course to know what to do. Just scrap the Roman Private Interpretations, receive the Lord Jesus Christ, and He will give you the *author of scripture* to help you straighten out the God-forsaken mess that Rome has made of the Holy Bible. The greatest private interpreter of scripture on the face of the earth has been, and always will be, the Roman See and "holy mother leaven" (Matt 13). Not once in eight interpretations does Rome exhibit any respect for scripture, any knowledge of comparative passages, any reverence for the authority of the Holy Ghost, and common sense in determining word usage, or any ability to discern likenesses and differences in wording. Such a jack-leg outfit was certainly never commissioned by anyone (let alone our Lord!) to be the "infallible *interpreter* of scripture." A church that is so sorry and so mean that it would have to write a ream of explanations to get around the plain meaning of *one verse* in an English Bible, is obviously shot through with corruption from the seat of its papal "britches," to the top of its phallic symbol in front of St. Peters (the Egyptian obelisk).

"Be not deceived; God is not mocked." Ignorance is not innocence. You can find the truth if you want it; and if you are still in Rome's bondage it is because *you don't want the truth* – it is too expensive!

To conclude our little study on private interpretation, let us list for our readers some of the table of contents found in the Knights of Columbus literature. When an inventory is taken of this stock, it will be seen immediately that the titles of the subject could have come from only one source. And every Bible-believer knows this source, for it is *the original questioner* of the Word of God.

1. "What About Adding to the Word of God?"
2. "Where is Purgatory Mentioned in the Bible?"
3. "Monks, Nuns, and Friday Abstinence."
4. "One Mediator and Intercessor – Christ, the Redeemer."

(From "Let Us Judge Catholics by the Bible.") In this book, every chapter discusses *how you can add to the Word, why there is a purgatory, why nuns are all right, and why there is more than one intercessor.* Plainly, the scriptures are discussed for the purpose of refuting them!

1. "Who Says the Catholic Church is Infallible?"
2. "The Bible is NOT the Full Authority."

(From "This Was the Faith of Our Fathers.") The first article is written to prove that it is; the second is written to prove that it is not.

1. "Say Dad, Who Founded Our Church?"
2. "The Need for Authority in Religion."
3. "There is No Mistaking Christ's Church."

(From "Why Catholics Keep Running to Church.") The entire book is written to prove that "rock" means "Peter," that "Christian" means "Catholic," that "hell" means "powers," that "body" means "Roman organization," and that "apostles" mean "Catholic priests."

1. "Brother, Are You Saved?"
2. "What's Wrong with Bingo?"
3. "Is It True That Catholic Countries Are Backward?"

(From "Yes, I Condemned the Catholic Church.") The first article is written to protect Catholics from true evangelistic, New Testament witnesses; the second is to justify gambling; and the third to prove that Mexico, Spain, and South America are the leading nations of the world.

1. "So You Have Been Saved?"
2. "Can the True Gospel Message be Found in the Catholic Church?"
3. "Can a Catholic Go Directly to God?"

(From "I Was Warned About the Catholic Church.") The first one is an attempt to divert a new convert to Rome, instead of to the Bible; the second is an attempt to prove that Catholic tradition – and not the Pauline epistles – is the "gospel"; and the third to prove that you *cannot* go to God without a papist inserted somewhere.

1. "The Rock That Was Simon."
2. "You Are NOT Saved by Faith Alone."
3. "Every Catholic is a 'Born-again' Christian."

(From "Does the Bible Contradict Itself?") The first is written to prove that – although the Greek, English, and Latin words for "rock" and "Simon Peter" are different – they are *the same,* really, since Rome says that they are the same! The second is a slander on Galatians 2 and 3, and Romans 5-10, using the Hebrew-Christian epistles. The third is to prove that if you have been sprinkled with water by a papist, you are *"born-again"!*

1. "What Is the Catholic Church?"
2. "Mass, the Eternal Sacrifice."
3. "The Structure of the Church."

(From "This Is the Catholic Church.") The first is written to prove that the word "Christian" means "Catholic," the word "body" means "Roman See," the word "church" means "Roman," and that the Roman Catholic Church (not mentioned anywhere in scripture) was actually what Christ meant, although He said something else. The second is written to prove that *the mass* (and not the crucifixion) is eternal; this is accomplished by saying that they are *the same,* although it is admitted that one is *bloody,* and the other *(the "eternal one"!!)* is *not bloody!* But since Rome says that they are the same, the fact that they are different is of no consequence. The third is written to prove that nuns, monks, and unmarried bishops are what Paul meant when he mentioned married bishops, no monks, and no nuns.

1. "Is the Catholic Church a Totalitarian State?"
2. "Is it a Threat to American Freedom?"
3. "What About Separation of Church and State?"

(From "Let's Test Catholic Loyalty.") All are written to prove that the Catholic Church is a nice, clean, democratic, cooperative, loyal, humble, law-abiding group – which, of course, is pure bosh.

1. "Why Do Protestants Believe as They Do?"
2. "Yes, Catholics Use the Bible."

(From "But Can It Be Found in the Bible?") Both are written to prove that Protestants are corrupt because they "privately interpret," and that papists are scriptural. This is pure rubbish, in view of the eight examples of private interpretation found in their own literature.

1. "He Wore A Silver Medal?"
2. "The Sign of the Cross."
3. "The Rosary – What Is It?"
4. "How Can Water be Holy?"
5. "What Are These Scapulars?"

(From "But Why the Candles, Holy Water, and Beads?") All are written to justify the pagan religious practices of Nimrod's Babylonian priesthood, set up several thousand years ahead of the first apostate Roman bishop.

ADDENDA: "Call No Man Father," "Outside the Church No Salvation," "What Goes On Behind Convent Walls," "But Why Do You Wear Such Funny Clothes?", "Do Catholics Rule America?", "But Are All Non-Catholics Headed for Hell?", "Do Catholics Really Adore Images or Statues?", "Are You Prepared to Understand the Bible?", "Why the Bible Needs An Authoritative Interpreter," "But Do You Have the Complete Bible?"

And so on into the night. The only proof that a Christian needs, in regard to Rome's private interpretation, is the fact that they have to expend over $20,000,000 a year trying to *explain* their practices which are contrary to scripture. Something that far on the wrong side of the tracks is obviously not *correct* interpretation. If it were correct, it would not have to spend ten centuries alibiing its discrepancies.

Rome, the great private interpreter of scripture, remains true to her standards as always; and these standards are the standards of Bible-rejecting, Bible-denying *sophists,* who profess obedience and submission to the scriptures. To Rome, the scriptures are only a text-book of source references to be used as convenient for

proving whatever Rome wishes to foist on her gullible adherents as *authoritative.* After fifteen hundred years of fairy stories, mythology, inquisitions, bingo parties, shrimp-fleet blessings, Fatimas, Perry Comos, and Bing Crosbys, the length to which she has gone has reached the place where it is in the category of the ridiculous. The texts are no longer even associated with Bible ideals, standards, principles, teachings, prophecies, or inspirations. Time after time, in order to enforce a "decree" or "dogma," Rome has perverted the scripture till she is at the place where she can no longer even be thought of as *connected with scripture.*

To enforce as New Testament Christianity the pagan blasphemous teachings of her Hierarchy, Rome has taken words out of verses, verses out of chapters, chapters out of books, books out of sections, ministries out of dispensations, added books that were not there, put primary teachings in the secondary position, overemphasized Jewish ministry in contrast to Christian ministry, ignored the Pauline doctrines of salvation, slandered the authority of the Holy Spirit, inserted words in verses as substitutions, invented comparisons that are not analogous, applied to Christians verses written to Jews, failed to rightly divide where necessary, and pronounced *"curses"* on anyone intelligent enough to spot her for what she is – a money-grabbing, power-hungry, religious hypocrite.

Rome was never in submission to the Word, and she never will be.

Rome will always profess to believe it in order to use it.

Her adherents will follow because they would prefer her authority to that of the One who wrote the scriptures.

"If any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant." Or to put it over the plate waist high, "When you get to hell, you'll get your theology straightened out."

Why not take God at His word – as He said it, where He said it, and for whom He intended it? (1Tim 2:5; John

3:16; 1Cor 15:1-8; John 1:12; Rom 10:9, 10, 13; 1John 5:10-13.)

Let the One Who wrote it interpret it for *you.* And whatever you do, don't trust Rome's "interpretation" for a minute. She is the greatest "private interpreter" and the *stupidest,* for Augustine, her first real "theologian," mistook the harlot on the seven hills to be the Bride of Christ! (See Rev 17, 18, 21, 22.)

BOOK LIST
PENSACOLA BIBLE PRESS
post office box 6036
Pensacola, Florida 32503

Books by Dr. Peter S. Ruckman

The Bible Believer's Commentary Series (600+ pages)

Genesis (4th Qtr '69)	$4.95
Matthew (1st Qtr '70)	4.95
Revelation (4th Qtr '69)	4.95

Two or more from the above for $3.95 each

The Kingdom (3rd Qtr '69)	$2.50
Manuscript Evidence (1st Qtr '70)	2.50

Two or more from the above for $2.00 each

Rome (3rd Qtr '69)	$1.25
Mark of the Beast (3rd Qtr '69)	1.25
Bible Babel	1.25
Genesis (Chapter 1-3) (3rd Qtr '69)	1.25

Three or more from the above for $1.00 each

Segregation or Integregation	$ .60

Two or more for $.50 each

The Real Issue	$ .40

Three for $1.00. Ten for $2.50

Selected Sermons

The Seven Sevens	$ .40
The Seven Baptisms	.40

Three or more from the above for $.35 each

Books by Dr. Edward F. Hills

Believing Bible Study	$2.00
Space Age Science	.75
Evolution in the Space Age	.60

All three of the above for $3.00

Prepaid orders are sent postpaid, others C.O.D.

THE BIBLE BELIEVER'S COMMENTARY SERIES

GENESIS

This is the first real *commentary* on the Book of Genesis; all others being *criticisms* of various degree. The reader will not only find valuable sermonic material in the commentary, but "up-dated" descriptions of the lives of the Patriarchs in 20th century language. Along with this will be found a detailed analysis of the mistakes of the Hebrew Scholars of the 19th century (Gesenius, Delitzsch, Keil, Starke, etc.,) and numerous illustrations of the corruptness of the so-called "LXX," which was written many years *after* the death of Paul. Every word of the English text has been received at face value, and the author has gone to some length to show how alterations of this text (of any sort or for any purpose) lead the Christian astray in receiving revelation. This book is a must for the Bible student or Bible teacher.

GENESIS (Chapters 1-3, Limited Edition)

This preview to The Bible Believer's Commentary on Genesis is designed to "whet the appetite" of all true students of the word of God. In 125 pages on the first three chapters of Genesis, the author defends, exposits, expounds, and exhausts the creation account. 6,000 years of world history, "scientific research," legends, myths, and "the latest discoveries" are collated to prove conclusively that the literal creation of the universe by the direct act of God (as found in the A.V. 1611 text) is the only sane, sensible, and scientific approach to the creation, and that all the modern theories of evolution, carbon dating, and "missing links" are not only absurd, but ridiculous. If you have any doubts about the creation account, or you know anyone who does, you *need* this small volume immediately.

MATTHEW

This is the first real Commentary ever written on Matthew, all others being either *criticisms* of the Book or else devotional works which avoided the problems of text and language.

The author takes the reader through all 28 chapters of the Book without once giving ground to textual critics, or conservative scholars who desire to rid themselves of the King James text. All critical problems are analyzed and discussed. The reader will find sermon outlines, illustrations, practical applications, and inspirational nuggets in the Commentary as well as the lengthy doctrinal discussions and exegetical material.

Every God-called preacher should have this volume, not only for purposes of sermon preparation and Bible teaching, but also for armament against the ravages of textual criticism carried on by Conservative Scholars (Machen, Westcott, Wilbur Smith, Robertson, etc.) as well as Liberal Scholars.

REVELATION

This work is an extremely simplified commentary on the Book of Revelation, which has reduced the work of Peters, Kemp, McClain, Pentecost, Larkin, Scofield, and Newell to 8th-grade language. The original text was transcribed from tapes made in an office, which were made for a young minister who was just learning how to read. The work includes several revelations unknown to the major authors of works on the Book of Revelation itself; this is attributed to the fact that "progressive revelation" always ceases where belief in the Bible ceases. "Dispensationalism" stops with the works of Bullinger and Larkin because both Bullinger and Larkin began to correct the Bible to prove their points. The reader of The Bible Believer's Commentary on Revelation will find himself in possession of a Commentary that refuses to change one word *(or one letter)* of the English text.

ROME – THE GREAT PRIVATE INTERPRETER

This small but valuable handbook deals with eight basic Christian doctrines and shows clearly how the Catholic Church has placed its own private interpretations over these doctrines and has invented doctrines of her own which are not even related to the Bible texts or the eight doctrines.

The evidence given shows that the Roman private interpretations are so far-fetched that they are not even related to the rules of grammar, the spelling of words, the common-sense meaning of words, or the basic rules of sixth-grade reading. This handbook is indispensable for the Christian worker who is faced with the heresies of Romanism, and it is a valuable tool for opening the eyes of deluded Papists who think that the Roman System is "Christian" or even related to Bible truth.

MARK OF THE BEAST

This 120 page book was written in 1960 and still stands as the final and exhaustive treatment of the person and work of the Anti-Christ, being a compilation of all previous works of all previous authors back to the Ante-Nicene Fathers. The book states the Anti-Christ's name, mark, number, letter, religion, size, shape, height, weight, physical characteristics, church, music, and mannerisms, and presents 18 types of the Anti-Christ given in the scripture, which combine to give a more detailed description of this personage than any person in the Bible outside of Jesus Christ Himself. Many of the prophecies found in the book were fulfilled between 1965 and 1969, and the reader will be shocked to find that the Anti-Christ's Bible and Music are given five years before either of them were given any publicity in the secular press.

SEGREGATION OR INTEGRATION

This small volume is an exhaustive treatment on the subject of Integration and Segregation from the Bible standpoint. Both sides of the argument are presented, and all the scriptures dealing with both sides are given. The author emphasizes the fact that whereas politicians, socialists, and preachers may have the liberty and power to enforce a lie, they have neither the right nor the privilege to misuse the word of God to enforce it.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD VERSUS THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN

This 250 page book is a Christian Political History, or more properly, a Christian Philosophy of History, analyzing history from the standpoint of infallible truth given previous to historical events. The author draws the line sharply between the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of Heaven, and contrary to popular theology, proves conclusively that they are different and never have been (nor will be) the same. The origination, development, history, and consummation of both Kingdoms are given with all scriptural references involved, and then secular history is laid alongside this history for an enlightening comparison. The book proves, among other things, that all wars are based on man's efforts to bring in a condition which only God can bring in, and a state of affairs which was prophesied more than 1000 years before the birth of Christ.

The reader will learn that Communism, Catholicism, and Capitalism are all man-made substitutes for "The Kingdom," and that Evolution is a religion (not a scientific fact) which is designed to replace the historical truths of the Bible.

THE BIBLE BABEL

A survey of the present day situation in regards to the translations which have attempted to replace the Authorized Version. Definite proof given that the King James Bible is the only Bible in this age which God will use, and definite proof that its critics are intellectually dishonest, lazy and superficial.

THE REAL ISSUE – "TELL IT LIKE IT IS!"

This completely new handbook is a *must* for every soul-winner. Fully illustrated, this pocket-size booklet takes the reader pictorially and Biblically through the plan of salvation step by step. Effective with children and adults alike. Makes personal work easier. Left by itself, the booklet "preaches" its own sermon. Conviction-bringing to the lost, instructional and edifying to the new convert, motivating to the experienced worker.

A CHRISTIAN'S HANDBOOK OF MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE

This is the latest and most complete book on textual criticism and manuscript evidence available. Its contents are considerably in advance of the works of Gregory, Westcott and Hort, Milligan, A.T. Robertson, Davis, Machen, Wuest, and Nestle. The author has relied heavily upon Dr. Edward Hills and Dean Burgon in presenting the evidence for the Received Text, but has also presented proof from the Greek Text itself to show that Vaticanus, Sinaiticus and associated manuscripts are Gnostic Depravations from the pen of Origen (180-230) and Eusebius (300-340). The young minister who is just starting to learn Greek, should obtain one of these Handbooks *immediately*. It will save his faith in the King James Bible and may save his ministry itself. The author presents evidence for the A.V. 1611 in this Handbook which never has been, nor can be controverted. In the back of the Handbook is conclusive evidence that every Bible version since 1880 is a *Roman Catholic Bible!*

SELECTED SERMONS

THE SEVEN SEVENS

This sermon by Dr. Ruckman deals directly with the time of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. When is the Lord Jesus Christ going to return? What will be the sign of His coming? Does anyone know the day or hour of the coming of the Son of Man? These and more questions are answered in this sermon. An illustrated dispensational "7-7's" chart in the back makes this sermon easy to understand and follow.

THE SEVEN BAPTISMS

This sermon by Dr. Ruckman takes up the topic of the different baptisms mentioned in the Bible. Though not commonly known, seven baptisms are to be distinguished in the scriptures. From Genesis to Revelation, this sermon points out their differences by comparing scripture with scripture.

(Other selected sermons to be forthcoming.)

THE EDITOR
July, 1969

20 Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.